LEADERS OF THE REFORMATION

THE WORLD'S BENEFACTORS SERIES

/20
#15
(22
ch

JOHN HUSS

LEADERS OF THE REFORMATION

BY

JOSEPH HENRY DUBBS, D.D., LL.D.

THE HEIDELBERG PRESS
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

PREFACE.

The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century is the principal source of our civil and religious freedom. We are living in the era which it inaugurated, and are moulded by its influence. For this reason it deserves to be studied by all who are interested in the development of the Church and State.

The author has not ventured to write a history of this eventful period. He has, however, made it the subject of many lectures, and of these a series is here presented. Though the best authorities have been consulted and freely quoted, the general purpose has been popular rather than scholastic. It has not been deemed necessary to burden the text with proofs and references. Of the work of the most distinguished leaders of the Reformation no more than a brief sketch has been attempted; but men of less celebrity have been assigned to the position which is believed to be their due.

It will be observed that there has been no disposition to exalt some men at the expense of others, and that subjects of controversy have not been prominently presented. It is believed that calm and dispassionate study of the lives of the Reformers will prove that they were all pervaded by a common life; and that though their errors were numerous their purposes were exalted. When these facts are fully recognized, prejudice and exclusiveness must pass away; and in the fullest sense of the prophecy, there will be one fold and one Shepherd.

GARNER & PENGELLY, PRS., READING, PA.

CONTENTS.

I.

THE DAWN OF THE REFORMATION.

(JOHN HUSS).

Introduction—The Dark Ages—Coming of the Dawn—Waldenses—Conservatives and Liberals—Mystics and Humanists—The Secularization of the Church. John Huss, a national leader—Disciple of Wycliffe—The Babylonish Captivity—Reformatory Councils—Pope John XXIII.—Council of Constance—Citation of Huss—Condemnation and death—The Hussite wars.

II.

THE GLORY OF THE REFORMATION.

(MARTIN LUTHER).

Luther's early life — Education — Monastic vows — Spiritual struggles—Journey to Rome—Frederick of Saxony—Indulgences — Theses — Conflicts—Excommunication—Burning of the Bull—Melancthon — Luther at Worms—The Wartburg — Carlstadt — Zwickan Prophets — Controversy with Henry VIII.—Luther's marriage—Table Talk—Personal character—Augsburg Confession—Last years and death.

III.

THE FREE CHURCH IN THE FREE STATE.

(ULRIC ZWINGLI).

Switzerland the refuge of the oppressed—Mercenary system—Zwingli's Birth—Wildhaus—Early training—Scholarship—Glarus—Einsiedlen — Relations to Erasmus—Patriotism—Pastorate in Zurich — Leo Juda — Domestic relations—Anabaptists — Marburg Conference — Organization of the churches—Battle of Cappel—Zwingli's death.

LEADERS OF THE REFORMATION

I.

THE DAWN OF THE REFORMATION.

JOHN HUSS.

THE Reformation of the sixteenth century was the greatest epoch in modern history. To regard it as the work of a single man, or of any definite body of men, is plainly unhistorical. We might as well call Napoleon Bonaparte the cause of the French Revolution; or assert that Abraham Lincoln was the originator of the civil war in America. Like every other great historical movement, the Reformation sprang from obscure sources in the remote past, and gathered strength from innumerable tributaries, until at last it became a mighty flood whose onward flow was irresistible.

The period immediately preceding the Reformation of the sixteenth century is known as the Middle Ages; or more properly, on account of its historic unity, as the Middle Age—*le Moyen age*—"das Mittelalter". It is so called because it is supposed to stand in the middle, between ancient and modern history. In round numbers, it extends for a thousand years from the fifth or sixth century to the fifteenth or sixteenth. Secular historians

generally regard it as beginning with the downfall of the western Roman empire in A.D. 476 and ending with the Fall of Constantinople, the Invention of Printing, the Discovery of America, or some other important event in the latter part of the fifteenth century. Ecclesiastical writers most frequently begin with Gregory the Great (about A.D. 600) and conclude with the Reformation. History, we know, is an organic process ; and it is impossible to draw an exact line of separation between its several periods ; but every age has its decided characteristics, and familiarity with these is essential to our comprehension of the divine life in its highest developments.

The Middle Ages have often been termed "the dark ages"; but it is Coleridge, we believe, who asserts that they are "dark only to those who have not light enough to read them". Light was always struggling with darkness. If it was a period of ignorance and depression, it was also the time of great inventions—of the beginnings of modern literature and science ; the period of the planting of the seeds which have sprung up and brought forth the flowers and fruit in which we now rejoice.

In order that we may comprehend all this it is necessary to remember that the Middle Ages include two widely contrasted periods. The first of these, extending to the Crusades (A.D. 1096) is the

Period of Destruction; the second, which ends with the Reformation, is the period of Reconstruction. The chief events of the first period are the migration of nations, the rise of Mahommedanism, the repulse of the Saracens, the revival of the Western Roman Empire under Charlemagne, the building up of monastic orders, and the establishment of the feudal system. During this period it seemed to be the purpose of most men to destroy as much as they possibly could; though here and there a solitary ruler, like Theodoric or Charlemagne, or an unusually intelligent abbot or prior, made an effort for the intellectual advancement of his people. It was the power of Christian life, however obscured by superstition, that saved the world from relapsing into absolute barbarism.

The next four centuries—the period of Reconstruction—exhibit a reaction in favor of law and order; the crusades gave birth to chivalry, modern languages came into existence, and monarchies were consolidated. It was, in fact, the period of the Dawn of the Reformation.

We regard the latter period with profound interest and sympathy, and do not hold with those who suppose that the church of the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation was utterly sunken and degraded. It was the coming of the dawn when men began to open their eyes and rejoice in the light. We refuse to renounce our

patrimony in English literature; we boast that Chaucer and Spenser, and Shakspeare are ours, though they sleep in a foreign land; may we not with equal propriety claim a share in Dante and Petrarch, in Gerson and D'Ailly, in Colet and Erasmus? If the church of modern times has taken up the best life of the period which preceded it, may we not with sympathetic throbbings feel the power of that life, as it beat in the hearts of the men who lived four hundred years ago? Is it not well to appreciate the continuity of Christ's promise; and when history recalls the learning, the piety, the self-sacrifice of the past, to exclaim with rapturous devotion: "This too, thank God, is mine"?

We do not look for the main sources of the Reformation among the mediæval sects. These had no doubt an important work to do, as forerunners of a new era; but in most instances they labored in obscure places, and exerted but little influence on the church and the world. Some of them—such as the Cathari, the Bulgari, and the Albigenses—were probably heretical. Others, like the Waldenses, were comparatively pure in doctrine and morals; but their influence was quiet and sometimes almost imperceptible. Indeed, it may be doubted whether the Waldenses, before the days of the Reformation, could properly be called a sect. They served the Lord in secret, and rarely ven-

tured to offer a public protest. On this account they may, perhaps, be regarded as a great secret society, whose members recognized each other by signs, rather than as a religious denomination in the modern sense of the term. Their organization is said to have been so extensive that a member might leave Piedmont on foot, and, traveling through Switzerland and down the Rhine, could lodge every night with a brother of his faith until he reached Holland, whence he could sail to England and there be sure of similar entertainment.

That the Waldenses, the "Friends of God", and similar organizations accomplished a great work in preparing the way for the Reformation we do not presume to deny; but the religious movement of the sixteenth century was too great to be derived from comparatively obscure sources. It must be remembered that in the church of Rome itself there were two distinct tendencies which might have been termed "Liberal" and "Conservative". The former was represented by the party of progress which rejoiced in the light that was beginning to break over the world; the latter was narrow and bigoted, clinging to a mass of mediæval lumber, and often substituting heathenish superstitions for Christian faith.

The Liberal party was already on the way that finally led to the great Reformation. Though it might be regarded as including all who cherished

aspirations for a higher life it was evident at a glance that the views of its members were neither clear nor harmonious. Among them were many different groups, or companies, which had little in common, except dissatisfaction with existing conditions. Most intelligent were the HUMANISTS, who were full of enthusiasm for Greek and Roman literature and art. Many of these were at heart infidels, who spoke of "the immortal gods" as though they actually believed in them, and did not hesitate to declare the church an obstacle to the higher development of civilization. At the opposite extreme stood the MYSTICS—men like Master Eckhart, John Tauler, and Thomas á Kempis—who had turned away with disgust from the scholastic controversies concerning Nominalism and Realism, holding that pious contemplation is better than all knowledge. That some of them fell into pantheism is not to be doubted; but compared with the dry teachings of the scholastics their writings are a beautiful garden. The authorities of the church regarded them with suspicion, but as they rarely taught doctrine it was difficult to find grounds for their condemnation.

In one thing the Liberalists agreed, and that was the necessity of a speedy reformation of the church. From all nations there went up a cry for a *reformatio in capite et membris.* That the church had become thoroughly secularized was evident to all.

The papacy was the prey of designing Italian princes; simony was almost universal—bishoprics were bought and sold; monasteries had become hotbeds of corruption; and the populace worshipped images under the impression that they were a real manifestation of the supernatural beings which they represented. Against all this the Liberals protested as decidedly as did the Protestants of the succeeding century; but they were never ready to take decisive action, and dreaded above all things the imputation of heresy. Hence it happened, in more than a single instance, that when one of their number—more intelligent and adventurous than the rest—advanced more rapidly than his associates, they were the first to cry out "Ho, there! Stop him! We do not go as far as this man goes. He is a heretic".

More than one of the pioneers was condemned at the instance of men who had been his earlier associates; but even in such instances the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church. Where one fell a hundred appeared to take his place; and with every onward step the army of progress grew bolder and more determined. They had no thought of separating from the church of Rome; but the time came at last when they were forced out of it. The majority—the party of reaction, the mediæval party—would not yield an iota to the demands of progress; and the most intelligent members of the

church were compelled to assume the position of independent protest which finally gave them the name of Protestants. It is in this great historical movement, rather than in the obscure sects of the middle ages, that we seek for the source of our evangelical Protestant Christianity.

In further illustration of our theme we direct your attention to John Huss, the Reformer and martyr of Bohemia. In some respects, it is true, the story may prove less interesting than those of later date. There are no legends to relate, like those which elsewhere twine like ivy around the ruins of the past. Least of all can we expect to be cheered by the genial glow of humor, for the days were hard and cold. The scene is far distant, and the actors appear but indistinctly through the mists of ages. It is, in fact, a fearful tragedy that gave rise to a series of wars which for merciless horror and pure atrocity are hardly equalled in the history of Europe.

JOHN HUSS was born in the village of Hussinecs, in Bohemia. The year of his birth is not quite certain, different authorities varying between 1369 and 1373. He is known to have perished on his birthday, July 6, 1415 ; and recent Bohemian writers declare that the year 1369 has been authenticated by researches in the national archives as the year of his birth. His forefathers were poor, and it does not seem likely that they had a surname. Until

his 26th year our hero called himself John of Hussinecs, after his birthplace; but he subsequently dropped the latter part of the name, probably for the sake of euphony. It was just becoming usual to adopt a surname, and John probably thought that in such matters his own taste was the supreme arbiter.

Concerning his early education little is known; but it is probable that he attended the Latin school of his native village. These Latin schools were conducted by the parish priest, and were primarily intended to teach boys enough Latin to enable them to assist in serving the mass. For this purpose very little was needed, as the priest himself had often but a vague idea of the meaning of his words, and the people did not care whether he said *sumpsimus* or *mumpsimus*.

How Huss was prepared for the university we do not know; probably little was required, except some facility in reading Latin. He became secretary to one of the professors at the university of Prague, and his office no doubt included brushing coats as well as writing letters. There are stories concerning his proficiency which have apparently been exaggerated, for there is nothing to show that he ever went beyond the ordinary curriculum. In fact, the records are said to show that his grade placed him exactly in the middle of his class; so that he had no cause to be exalted or humiliated. In later life he is said to have had some knowledge

of Greek and Hebrew ; but this learning may have been acquired by post-graduate study. His manners are said to have been naturally courteous, and he soon gained many influential friends. Without being exactly handsome he had refined features and a keen eye ; and his general appearance conveyed the impression of being what Westerners call "quick on the trigger". Above all he possessed in a remarkable degree the gift of eloquence, so that his words sounded like music and went straight to the heart. It was this gift that attracted the attention of his superiors, and made him even in his student days an idol of the national Bohemian party.

Bohemia, we know, is generally regarded as one of the provinces of Austria ; but its people insist that it is an ancient kingdom, of vastly more historic importance than the original arch-duchy of Austria itself. Though Bohemia stretches westward, like a great peninsula between Saxony and Bavaria, until it almost reaches the heart of Germany, it is not really a German country. Nearly two-thirds of its population, which is estimated at five millions, are of Slavonic race, speaking a language which is known as Czech. Here, for more than a thousand years, the Teuton and the Slav have struggled for supremacy, and many are the battles which they have fought with sword and pen. Politically the Germans have proved stronger than

the Czechs, but they have not been able to Germanize Bohemia. Invasions there have been which, like the ocean forcing its way into the estuary of a mighty river, were for a time irresistible; but when the tide went down the stream flowed on as it had done before. Recently there has been a kind of Bohemian *renaissance;* and since Hungary has gained a position in the empire equal to that of Austria, Bohemia insists on its ancient privileges and demands similar recognition. These local conditions may appear foreign to our theme; but they enable us to appreciate the position of the man who aspired to be not only the reformer of the church but the saviour of Bohemia.

The early career of John Huss was uniformly brilliant and successful. In 1393 he was graduated a Bachelor of Arts, and three years later received the degree of Master, very much as he might have done four hundred years later in an American college. He probably served as Tutor for a few years, as was usual in those days, and in 1400 became a regular professor. At the same time he served as preacher at the Bethlehem chapel, and received the appointment of confessor to Sophie of Bavaria, wife of Winceslaus, king of Bohemia. In the succeeding year he was promoted to the office of Dean of the Theological Faculty, and in 1409 became *Rector Magnificus* of the university of Prague. It was a grand position for a man of

forty, in full possession of all his powers—a man whom a nation was proud to recognize as its chief. Many a man, under similar circumstances, would have supposed himself to have reached the summit of his ambition ; and might thereafter have taken his *otium cum dignitate*, leaving the management of the university to the deans of the several faculties, or, possibly, when a vacancy occurred, watching his chance to be made archbishop of Prague.

Huss, however, was not of this type. He was of an active nature ; energetic and often imprudent, he seems to have sought obstacles in order to overcome them. Even at this early date his piety was conspicuous. He advised the students to make the Bible their only *vade mecum* ; and boldly declared that he had found in it many things which did not agree with the teaching of the popes.

The university of Prague was at this time at the summit of its glory. It was the only university in the north of continental Europe, and was attended by several thousand students, some of whom came from distant England. Its government was in many respects peculiar. The institution was divided into four sections, representing four countries—Saxony, Poland, Bavaria, and Bohemia—and each section had one vote in the general management. By this arrangement the Germans had practically three votes—for Poland was regarded as German—and the Bohemians had but one. Suddenly the

Emperor Winceslaus, in the most arbitrary manner changed the arrangement, giving three votes to the Bohemians and leaving but one to the Germans. Winceslaus, it should be remembered, was both King of Bohemia and Emperor of Germany. In Germany he had very little influence; but he resented his unpopularity and did all in his power to advance the interests of his hereditary kingdom. At his instance Huss was chosen Rector of the university, because he was a leader of the Czechs; and the Germans, therefore, regarded him with ill-concealed aversion. It was at this time that he began to express himself concerning the faith and practice of the church with a degree of boldness that enabled his enemies to injure him at a vital point. Personally he claimed to be impartial in the political conflict; but he unconsciously revealed his position by remarking in one of his letters, that he "had always preferred a good German to a bad Bohemian". The excitement aroused on the two grounds of opposition—political and religious—became so intense and uncontrollable, that before the close of the first year of his rectorate the German professors and students withdrew in a body from the university of Prague and founded the university of Leipsic.

At this time occurred the change in the theologic position of Huss which determined the character of his subsequent career. English students had lent

him the writings of John Wycliffe, canon of Lutterworth, who had died in 1384. Some writers assert that they were given him by his intimate friend and subsequent fellow-martyr, Jerome of Prague, but this appears improbable. It is certain that Huss read these books with sympathy and enthusiasm, and that he was converted by them. He himself always asserted that at the time when he undertook to study the writings of Wycliffe they were accompanied by a certificate from the university of Oxford, to the effect that they had been examined and found orthodox; and there has been much controversy whether the endorsement was genuine or a forgery. As the document has been lost the question will probably never be settled.

If we had undertaken to discuss the career of Wycliffe there would certainly be enough to say; but our theme admits but a few references to "the morning-star of the Reformation". That he was one of the greatest men of his age cannot be doubted. His learning and ability were beyond all dispute. With undaunted courage he attacked the corruption of the church of Rome; and gained the undying hatred of the priesthood by declaring that the church had no right to hold property that was devoted solely to secular uses. Neander thinks he went too far in this direction; but it was chiefly on this ground that he was supported by King Edward III., who was jealous of the wealth of the church.

Wycliffe's words have a strangely modern sound. Though he had not grasped the doctrine of justification by faith, he certainly recognized the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice. On the subject of predestination he at first followed St. Augustine, but subsequently went far beyond him. He defined the church as consisting only of those who are predestinated to eternal life; and on this ground he concluded that the external organization of the church is at least unnecessary. From this position there was but a step to public opposition, and Wycliffe did not hesitate to take it. Single handed he fought the monastic orders, and roused the people to devotion for their king. Wycliffe even trained and sent out lay preachers, to preach the Gospel to the poor. These men were known as Lollards, though the term had been applied to religious people at an earlier date. Wycliffe was content to remain a simple parish priest, and thus escaped many of the penalties of greatness. Charges were brought against him, but they remained undecided and he was suffered to die in peace. Thirty years after his death his enemies, at the council of Constance, actually succeeded in securing his condemnation, and his poor old bones were taken from the grave and burnt and the ashes thrown into the river Avon. Hence a poet has said:

"The Avon to the Severn runs,
And Severn to the sea;
And Wycliffe's dust shall spread abroad
Wide as the waters be."

The work of Wycliffe exerted but little immediate influence on the social life of England. It lingered long in obscure places, but its power was broken in a single generation. Yet, have we not heard of conflagrations where a single burning brand was borne by the storm to some distant place where it blazed long after the earlier flames had been extinguished? So the doctrine of Wycliffe was carried to Bohemia, taken up by Huss, and through his instrumentality made for a time the religion of a nation.

The doctrines of Huss do not seem to have varied from those of Wycliffe to any appreciable extent. He had his Bohemian predecessors, it is true—men like Matthias of Janow and John of Stekno—who had exposed the hypocrisy and wickedness of the monks; but these were moral rather than doctrinal reformers. It was the main purpose of Huss to popularize the writings of Wycliffe and to preach the Gospel which they revealed. In one of his sermons he says: "Bohemians are now declared to be heretics—that sacred Bohemian nation of which a proverb declares, 'No Bohemian can be a heretic'. Here within this city, they say there are countless heretics, whom they term *Wycliffists*. As for me I confess before you that I have read and studied the works of Master John Wycliffe, and that I have learned from them much that is good. Truly, not everything I have read is of the same weight with

me as the Gospel, for only to the Holy Scriptures will I maintain such reverent obedience; but why should we not study the books of Wycliffe in which are written thousands of sacred truths".

Let us seek to become familiar with the times in which Huss lived and labored, in order that we may comprehend his message and his fate. It was the period of the deepest humiliation of the church. In 1309, Pope Clement V., a Frenchman, had removed the seat of the papacy from Rome to Avignon in France; and he and his immediate successors were little more than tools of the French king. This period is called "the Babylonish captivity" because, like the captivity of ancient Israel, it lasted about seventy years. The papal court became scandalously corrupt, so that it was said that when the papacy was removed from Rome the moral law was suspended. The only thing that can be said in its behalf is that it encouraged literature, and that its retirement to the beautiful land of Provence had a tendency to develop a love of the beautiful. It was the age of Petrarch and Boccaccio, of the beginnings of Italian literature. The church at large was, however, disgusted with the looseness of life which prevailed in Avignon, and earnestly insisted that the pope should return to Rome. When John XXII. was elected pope he promised that the first time he mounted a beast it should be to ride to Rome, but he saved his con-

science by never mounting a beast. No wonder that the popes did not desire to live in the city of St. Peter. It was torn by contending factions ; the Orsini and Colonna fought pitched battles in its streets; and afterwards Rienzi, "the last of the tribunes", actually attempted to found a new religion, and is said to have declared himself "the representative and successor of the Holy Spirit". During these conflicts Rome had ceased to be a desirable residence ; the sewers had been choked up, the campania had encroached on the city, and the place had become malarious beyond anything previously known. This, we remember was the period of the great plague—"the black death"—of which in the year 1348 one-third of the people of France died. Many people regarded all this evil as the direct consequence of the sins of the world, of which they esteemed the pope's removal from Rome as the greatest; and at last the complaints became so loud that in 1378 the pope was constrained to return to the holy city. This did not please the French, who had hitherto managed the papacy pretty much as they pleased, and another pope was irregularly chosen who reigned in Avignon. This miserable condition continued for many years, and sometimes there were no less than three men who claimed to be popes, all cursing and excommunicating each other. Some of the universities refused to acknowledge either claimant, and demanded

the calling of a general council; and John Gerson, the most learned theologian of his time, laid down the principle that "a universal council is superior to the pope". That this principle is not in accordance with the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope needs hardly be stated.

In consequence of this movement for a reformation three great councils were successively held at Pisa, Constance, and Basel, which are known as Reformatory Councils. It is with the second of these councils that we are at present especially concerned.

When we speak of a mediæval council it must not be supposed that it was a mere meeting of ministers and elders, continuing a week or two, like a modern synod. Imagine a company of several thousand prelates and distinguished theologians, accompanied by their secretaries and servants. Princes were present as interested spectators, as well as a great multitude of purveyors of food and pleasure. A council was, in fact, a city in itself. Those who attended it came prepared to remain for years, if need be, and some of the bishops actually built houses to be occupied by them during their attendance on the council. The council of Constance occupied less time than several similar assemblies, though it remained in session for more than four years.

The most important business that claimed the

attention of this council was the divided condition of the papacy. There were three men who claimed to be pope, of whom the most prominent was Baldassare Cossa who reigned under the title of John XXIII. He is said to have been a corsair in his youth and was certainly one of the worst of his line . That such a man could secure an election to the papal chair is in itself an abundant proof of the wickedness of the times.

The plans of pope John were at first successful. His enormous wealth enabled him to purchase the favor of cardinals and universities and he did not doubt that he could control a general council and secure recognition as the only legitimate pope. It happened, however, that Ladislaus, king of Naples, who appears to have no fear of ecclesiastical dignities, took Rome and drove the pope out of the city. John's wrath knew no bounds, and he actually called upon Christian princes to conduct a crusade against the enemy of "the Lord's anointed", but no one responded to his invitation. In his desperation he then appealed to the emperor, Sigismund, expressing his willingness to submit the question at issue to a general council, and at the same time authorized its convocation. The emperor at once convoked the council, and appointed Constance, in Germany, as the place of meeting. This did not suit pope John at all. An Italian council he might

(1) Theodorus Niemius. Historia de Vita Johannis XXIII., p. 17.

have controlled, but a meeting in Germany was more doubtful. In the mean time King Ladislaus died, and in the opinion of the pope the chief reason for the meeting was thus removed. To make the best of a bad bargian he, however, was present at the opening of the council, though with many misgivings concerning the result. Just as he entered Constance his carriage upset in the snow; and, as he lay on his back in the road in all the splendor of his papal robes, he exclaimed: "Here I lie, in the name of the devil! Why had I not sense enough to remain in Bologna?"

The pope's forebodings were not groundless. At the first meeting of the council he was permitted to preside; but he was soon requested to resign the papacy; and when he refused the council summarily deposed him and the two other claimants, and elected a prince of the great Roman house of Colonna who afterwards resigned under the title of Martin V. As John still protested the council imprisoned him until he agreed to submit to its decision. He finally agreed to accept the second place under the new administration, as dean of the college of cardinals.

The council of Constance did some good work, but it was mostly in the line of discipline and morals. In these directions it went as far as it was possible to go; and in the opinion of some people it had even committed the sin of sacrilege by lay-

ing its hands on the Lord's anointed. For this reason, though it had ventured to change the external organization of the church, it wanted all the world to know that its members were sound in faith and doctrine. It was not a safe tribunal for any one who was accused of heresy.

Before this council John Huss was cited to appear. He had previously been condemned by the anti-pope, Alexander V.; but the Bohemians did not recognize his authority, and, indeed, many of them refused to acknowledge the authority of any pope. Some of the professors of the university, however, turned against Huss, because he said that the head of the church was not St. Peter but Christ alone.

The Emperor Winceslaus had by this time resigned his office in favor of his brother Sigismund, who was extremely anxious to gain the favor of the Germans and of the court of Rome. Heavy clouds were gathering around the Reformer of Bohemia; but every day his views of divine truth became brighter and clearer. He began one of his books by saying: "Ye should not *burn* the writings of heretics, but should *read* them in order that ye may know what is true". The sale of indulgences disgusted his mind, as it afterwards did that of Luther; and he boldly declared that the church has no right to sell its treasures of grace, and that to do so is to commit the sin of Simon the sorcerer.

He was charged with disagreeing with the church on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but on this subject he did not go as far as the Reformers of the sixteenth century. I cannot even find that he insisted on giving the cup to the laity, which his followers afterwards made their "shibboleth". Every day, however, brought more light, and nothing afforded him more pleasure than to take long journeys, preaching the Gospel daily to thousands of people.

When Huss was cited to appear before the council of Constance he greatly rejoiced. Unacquainted with the treacherous ways of southern prelates, he hoped for an opportunity to declare the truth before the whole of Christendom, believing in the innocence of his heart that the truth, as he was able to present it, need only be heard to be believed. The emperor gave him a safe-conduct—a pass which promised him protection and security during his visit to Constance. The danger then seemed reduced to a minimum, and Huss did not hesitate to undertake the journey.

It is true that he seems to have felt a premonition of evil. He made his will, and wrote a long letter to his nephews, to whom he was greatly attached; "for this", he said, "is a trying time, and none should enter the ministry but those who are willing to die for the cause of truth". It was, indeed, a cruel, trying age, when men were burned

at the stake on all sorts of pretexts. Two merchants had just been executed in Prague for adulterating some saffron which they had sold in the market. On this occasion Huss said: "If I am to be burned I desire it to be for a better cause. I am willing to be a martyr in the cause of truth".

The journey to Constance had all the appearance of a triumphal procession. Huss was accompanied by four imperial knights and a small company of adherents. As he travelled through Germany he was greatly surprised to find that national prejudices had for the time been laid aside, and that at every town he was welcomed by enthusiastic multitudes. This only shows how heavily the yoke of Rome rested on the nation, and how earnestly the world longed for the day of its deliverance.

At Constance the great Bohemian was received with many marks of distinction. For a month he was free, and he was evidently gaining influence, when his enemies proceeded to carry out the plans which they had laid for his destruction. The streets were placarded with denunciations of Huss as a heretic; it was announced that he was about to escape; and in contradiction to his safe-conduct he was seized and imprisoned. When he claimed his rights, he was answered with the horrible assertion that it is not necessary to keep faith with heretics. He was brought before the council; but there was a general cry of "Heretic!" and he

was unable to speak a word. At the solicitation of prominent liberals he was afterwards permitted to reply to questions. The charges against him were vague and contradictory, the principal one being that he had taught in Bohemia the doctrines of Wycliffe. The prosecutors were afraid to enter minutely into questions of doctrine, knowing that there was hardly a question on which they were agreed. Huss was accused of having said that he appealed from the council to Christ—as though that were a great impiety. When he was charged with having said that "if he had not appeared willingly the council could not have compelled him", an old Bohemian nobleman rose to his feet and exclaimed: "That is true! There are a hundred Bohemian noblemen who would have been proud to receive him into their castles, where he might have remained safe from all his enemies".

The trial was a mere form. Thirty-nine extracts from his writings were presented and he was required to retract them without explanation or defense. Huss replied that he could not be expected to retract until the falsity of his statements had been shown. He insisted that these garbled extracts represented him as saying things which he had never believed, and that he could not retract them without becoming guilty of perjury. Abundant promises were made if he would consent to retract, and an ingenious formula was drawn up to

overcome his scruples, but nothing could shake his resolution. His conduct throughout was calm and dignified; not a word of complaint fell from his lips. On the 24th of June his books were publicly burned, and this, as Huss well understood, was but a prelude to his final condemnation. In a letter to his friends in Prague he said: "I write this in prison and in chains, expecting to-morrow to receive sentence of death, but full of hope in God that I shall not swerve from the truth, nor abjure errors imputed to me by false witnesses". On the 6th of July, 1415, the formal act of condemnation took place, accompanied by the foolish ceremonies which were usual on such occasions. He was arrayed in fantastic garments, solemnly excommunicated, and his soul formally presented to the devil; but Huss lifted up his eyes to heaven and said: "I commend my soul to its Maker and Redeemer". Then the martyr was handed over to the secular authorities and led away to be executed, while the council went on with its regular business as if nothing had happened.

The place of execution was by the road-side, a short distance from the town of Constance, and is now marked by a large stone. Here the victim was tied to a stake and the faggots piled around him. An old peasant brought a few sticks and laid them on the pile, hoping to gain a heavenly reward by contributing to the burning of a heretic. When

Huss saw this he smiled, and said : "*O sancta simplicitas!*" Once more urged to recant, his only reply was : "God is my witness that I have never taught what false witnesses have testified against me. He knows that the great object of my life was to convert man from sin. In the truth of that Gospel which I have written, taught, and preached I now joyfully die".

On the final scene we shall not dwell. From the midst of the gloom and smoke and darkness there came a single cry : "*Kyrie Eleison!*" When all was over some one gathered up a handful of ashes and cast them into the Rhine.

In the history of the church and the world there is but one scene which is more terrible than this ; and yet we remember that those who described it had not a word of condemnation for the wicked men who condemned the righteous. They left it all to God. Shall we attempt to do otherwise? Such a colossal crime is its own terrific condemnation.

The members of the council of Constance no doubt supposed that they had not only secured peace to the church but had proclaimed themselves the guardians of ancient orthodoxy. That they were mistaken need hardly be said. They had not counted on the wrath of Bohemia, robbed of her favorite son. No people had ever before been so deeply stirred, or become so fully engrossed by a

wild desire for vengeance. Hitherto kings and nobles had made war, and the people had been unwillingly driven to fight the battles of their lords. Now it was the people who held deliberative assemblies and forced the nobles to lead them to battle. Priests who ventured to reflect on the memory of John Huss were put to death with scant ceremony, and the imperial delegates who appeared before the national council were thrown out of the window. Multitudes that had hitherto cared very little for religious questions now united in demanding instant and complete separation from the church of Rome. When, one year later, Jerome of Prague —who had gone to Constance to be the counsel and adviser of John Huss—was also burned at the stake, the friends of the martyrs held a meeting and made the offering of the cup to the laity in the sacrament of the eucharist the badge and purpose of their covenant. On the death of Wenceslaus, in 1419, the Hussites refused to acknowledge Sigismund as his successor, and chose a nobleman, named John Ziska, to be their leader in the conflict with Rome and the empire.

Ziska was a remarkable, and withal a somewhat mysterious personage. Not much is known about him personally, except that he was very ugly, had but one eye and that he could fight. O, how he could fight! I am not fond of war, I deprecate its horrors, but if it must come, and in a just cause, I

love a mighty warrior before the Lord. Not once only but many times John Ziska with his Taborites beat the emperor, the German princes and the crusade of the pope. When the Hussite general was entirely blinded he kept on fighting and beating his enemies as he had done before ; and it is said, on rather doubtful authority, that when he felt that the end of life was at hand he gave directions that after his death his body should be flayed and his skin stretched over the head of a drum ; so that when the drum was beat his voice might still be heard in the thick of the battle. What a grand old barbarian he was !

When Ziska died many of his friends lost courage, and a large party which had been closely attached to him called themselves "The Orphans". His successor Procopius, who had been a priest or monk, however, showed himself every inch a soldier. He conceived the idea of carrying the war into the enemy's country and swept northern Germany with the besom of destruction.

Procopius fell in battle, and then came the beginning of the end. The Hussites were divided among themselves ; one party professed themselves ready to be reconciled with Rome if they were permitted to receive the cup in the Lord's Supper, and were therefore called Calixtines, from *calix*, a cup ; the other party were known as Taborites, after a mountain where they had held their earliest important

meeting. These parties quarreled, and now Rome saw her opportunity. The pope granted to Bohemia the privilege of receiving the sacrament in both kinds, and thus drove a wedge through the Hussite ranks. The Taborites still resisted, but were utterly defeated at Böhmischbrod, in 1434, and soon afterwards ceased to be a political party. Persecutions followed, and many Bohemians found a refuge in other countries, especially in Switzerland. The Calixtines soon accommodated themselves to the state of affairs and became Roman Catholics; the Taborites grew weaker and weaker, changed their name to "Brethren", and finally, after existing for many years as the so-called "hidden seed", became the nucleus of the Christian denomination which is now known as Moravians. In the sixteenth century, when persecution was most intense, many Hussites joined the Lutheran and Reformed churches, and there is still in Bohemia a little cluster of Protestant congregations which claims to be descended from the ancient Hussites.

Thus it may appear as if the work of Huss had reached a weak and impotent conclusion; but this is a mistake. Huss died for truths which are inherent in the church and in the heart of man, though they were for a time suppressed by the tremendous power of an established system. By his death, no less than by his life, he shows forth the truth that Protestantism is not an invention of

the sixteenth century, but flows from the profoundest life of early Christianity. It may not have been approved at the Vatican, but it leads back to Calvary. The death of Huss was by his cotemporaries regarded as shameful, but it had a glory of its own; for

> " Whether within the dungeon deep,
> Or in the battle's van,
> The noblest place for man to die
> Is where he dies for man.',

The Hussite wars were cruel—almost barbarous —but they were not failures. It would be easy to show how in a negative way they made the great Reformation possible. If Ziska and Procopius had not shaken the power of the church and empire, Luther would probably have been burnt at Worms.

We do not bring a railing accusation against the church of Rome. The world has greatly changed since the days of Huss and Wycliffe, and it would be folly to treat of the events of their lives as if they had happened yesterday. But we venture to say, that Rome is no less indebted to John Huss than are the Protestant churches. He died for truth and purity; for freedom of speech and liberty of conscience. " The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church "; and the precious seed sowed at Constance, though frost-bitten, never died; and is now bearing the glorious fruit in which the world rejoices.

II.

THE GLORY OF THE REFORMATION.

MARTIN LUTHER.

MARTIN LUTHER is the representative German of the sixteenth century. Without studying the century you cannot understand his career; without familiarity with his career you cannot comprehend his age. He does not represent the classes but the masses. He was not skilled in the ways of courts; he had not the literary culture of the leaders of the renaissance; but by the power of consecrated genius he became the spokesman of the silent millions—the leader of the greatest religious and social movement in the history of the world. When we read his books we are at first repelled by their peculiarities and then subdued by their power. "It is", to use the figure employed in another connection by the philosopher Hegel, "as if an archangel were attempting to reproduce the melodies of heaven on an imperfect human instrument—the theme is glorious but the execution is full of discords". No man of his century was so intensely hated, and historians are still kept busy in refuting the falsehoods of that lying age; no man in modern history has been so extravagantly praised. Somewhere between these extremes the truth must be found; but our conception of it will at best remain one-sided and incom-

MARTIN LUTHER

plete. To characterize so great a man as Luther is like attempting to paint a picture of Mont Blanc —the view taken may be perfectly accurate from one point of observation but it utterly fails from another. Possibly we may gain the best conception of this remarkable man by relating in simple words the story of his life, striving to catch a glimpse of his person now and then as we follow him in his wonderful career.

Martin Luther was born November 10th, 1483, at the village of Eisleben in Electoral Saxony. His father's name was Hans, and his mother's maiden name was Gretha (Margaretha) Ziegler.[1] Luther's father was a miner but belonged to a family of farmers that had become impoverished. That the family was once of some importance is evident from the fact that they had a coat-of-arms which appears on the old Luther house at Mansfeld, and also on documents signed by Martin Luther's brother Jacob. It bears a rose and a bow and arrows. Martin Luther seems never to have used the coat-of-arms, but he utilized the rose on his seal—that celebrated seal which represents a cross resting on a heart which is in turn supported by a full-blown rose, and bears an inscription which may be translated :

> "The Christian's heart doth rest on roses
> When it beneath the cross reposes".

(1) Some writers erroneously allege that her name was Lindeman ; but the latter was in fact the maiden name of Luther's grandmother.

A few months before the birth of Martin, the eldest son, Hans Luther, removed from Möhra, where the family had long been settled, to the little village of Eisleben, and soon after that event to Mansfeld, several miles distant, where he continued to labor as a miner. It was the old story—the mines were prosperous, the land was poor, so the agriculturist took a lower social position to win higher wages. Hans Luther was, however, not the kind of man to remain long in such a position without making an effort to improve it. Very soon we find him conducting two ovens in which ores were roasted—the elector of Saxony knew him personally and gave him his confidence—so that he gradually became a man of substance. He brought up a family of seven children, and left an estate of about $5000 which would now be worth three or four times as much. That was a pretty good showing for a poor miner. In Martin's boyhood the family was compelled to struggle with intense poverty. In his later writings he confesses that he and Philip Melancthon had studied astrology in the hope of finding something remarkable in the conjunction of the planets at the moment of his birth[1]; but he had found nothing that could give him comfort.[1] He says: "My father was a poor miner; my mother carried all our wood upon her back, that she might warm and rear us; their life was one of

(1) Juncker's *Ehrengedæchtniss Lutheri*, p. 10.

severe toil and extreme privation; at the present day people would hardly hold out long under such circumstances". It is greatly to Luther's credit that he always honored his parents. When he came to prepare a marriage service for the Protestant churches he immortalized their names by writing: "Dost thou Hans take Gretha to be thy wedded wife"?

Luther had a hard youth and was probably not easy to manage. He was so full of physical vigor that like an untamed colt, it was difficult to keep him in the traces. At school he tells us he was whipped fifteen times in one morning. At this school he learned to read and write, and committed to memory the Creed, Lord's Prayer, Ten Commandments, and some hymns. He really gave more heed to the teaching of the miners who told him ancient legends—possibly about Dr. Faustus, Till Owlglass, and Reynard the Fox—and filled his mind with strange stories about witches, cobolds and hobgoblins—stories which clung to him all his life. He did not appreciate the fact that these miners were teaching him his native language. In those days scholars generally spoke debased Latin, and many of them, in their contempt for the speech of the people, refused to speak German at all. There was, indeed, a kind of German which had grown up at the courts, artificial, involved, and full of repetitions; but it was never in any proper sense

the language of the people. Every valley in Germany had, however, its peculiar dialect—rude, harsh and unpolished—and neighbors were often unable to understand each other's speech. Curiously enough it was the Saxon dialect alone which possessed capacities for literary development, and in later life Luther utilized them to the utmost. In Latin he was inferior to many of his cotemporaries; but in pure idiomatic German he rose immeasureably higher than them all. Schaff says: "The hardships of Luther's youth and the want of refined breeding show themselves in his writings and actions. They limited his influence among the higher and cultivated classes, but increased his power among the middle and lower. He was a man of the people and for the people. He was not a polished diamond, but a rough block cut out from a granite mountain, and well fitted for the base of a mighty structure. He laid the foundation and others finished the upper stories".

Luther's father was ambitious and encouraged his son to study, though he did very little to assist him. At an early age the boy went to school in Magdeburg and Eisenach, and in his fourteenth year began to support himself by singing in the streets. The traditions of the poor scholars of the Middle Ages had not yet passed away, and this method of securing an education was not disreputable. It was at Eisenach that Ursula Cotta, the

wife of the leading merchant of the town, immortalized herself by giving the boy a seat at her table.

When Luther attended the university of Erfurt he did not seek associates among the humanists. He was no worshipper of the Greeks, and was not attracted by the new heathenism of the renaissance. From the beginning he sympathized more with the scholastics and mystics than with the men of the new era. He acquired the Latin language to such a degree that he could speak and write it with fluency; but he was painfully aware that his style was not Ciceronian. Greek and Hebrew he neglected, and acquired a working knowledge of these languages only when his life-work rendered it necessary. Mediæval philosophy he studied at a time when the humanists were discarding it, and became an expert and powerful reasoner. In brief, he did not propose to live the life of a recluse, and studied those things which he believed would prove useful in a public and political career. He took the degree of Bachelor of Arts with credit, and in 1503 was promoted to be a Master of Arts. On the latter occasion his friends held a little torchlight procession in his honor, and this event he ever afterwards regarded as the happiest of his life. About this time Luther's father, who had now become more liberal, presented him a set of the *Corpus Juris*—a series of legal volumes which had cost him a great deal of money. He was anxious

that his son should become a lawyer; for he had probably noticed—as has more recently been observed by others—that "when Providence distributes the good things of this life, lawyers are pretty sure to receive their share". For a year or two the son studied the old Roman law, and there can be no doubt that it did him a great deal of good. It is hardly a mere coincidence that the two leading Reformers—Luther and Calvin—were once students of law; and it is altogether likely that even at the present day young theologians would be considerably improved by a course of Blackstone.

Hans Luther, at Mansfeld, was rejoicing at his son's progress in legal study, when suddenly he received a message that the young man—at the age of twenty-one—had broken away from all his earlier associations and become a monk. At present we can hardly appreciate the terrible nature of such tidings. The father was a practical man of the world who had no liking for monks and monkery. According to the notions of the age the son was now practically dead to his family, to society, and to every hope of earthly happiness. Imagine a father—if such a thing could happen without disgrace—receiving news that a son, who had recently graduated at college, had been condemned to life-long imprisonment, and you can form some idea of Hans Luther's disappointment and grief. Worst of all, Martin had been persuaded by the monks

that it was his duty to take this step without consulting his father; and this the latter regarded as a personal slight which it took him years to forgive. When his son was ordained a priest he allowed himself to be persuaded to be present at the festivities; but when some one asked him whether he was not proud of his son's promotion, he replied: "Have you not read in the Scripture: 'Honor thy father and mother'"? Indeed, it was not until Martin had separated from Rome and had become a married man that he entirely forgave the past and heartily rejoiced in his brilliant career. It may perhaps be doubted whether Hans Luther was ever profoundly attached to the church of Rome.

What induced Martin Luther to become a monk we do not exactly know. The old story is that his friend Alexis was killed by lightning at his side; but there is some authority for believing that this friend was killed in a duel. Other writers say that Luther was terribly frightened by a thunder-storm during which he fell stunned to the earth, and that in his terror he exclaimed: "Help, St. Anna, and I will become a monk". He himself intimates the step was taken in accordance with a vow which he had hastily made in an hour of danger.

Luther's sojourn in the convent at Erfurt was a necessary stadium in his religious development. It was for him a period of intense conflict, and in his mind mediæval doctrine and modern ideas were

strangely mingled. That he was profoundly in earnest can not be doubted. He submitted to every possible penance and almost starved himself to death. As he himself said: "If ever a monk could have got to heaven by monkery, I was that monk". Every morning he repeated the "Pater Noster" and the "Hail Mary" twenty-five times, rehearsing them, as he afterwards declared, "just like a parrot". After going through his devotions he worried himself because he had not been sufficiently devout. He constantly reproached himself with imaginary transgressions, crying day and night, like Simeon on his pillar: "Have mercy, Lord, and take away my sin"! In his extremity he turned to John von Staupitz, the head of the Augustinian order in Germany—a man of great learning and piety, who is generally regarded as one of the "Reformers before the Reformation". This man became Luther's spiritual father and did all in his power to show him a better way; though when the decisive moment came he shrank back and died in the communion of Rome. When Luther confessed his sins to him he spoke only of evil thoughts; "for", he said, "these are the root of the whole matter". Staupitz said: "You desire to be without sin and yet are free from real sin. These temptations are necessary for you, but for you only". "He simply meant", says Luther, "that without such temptation I would become

proud and haughty". Later on Luther understood better how to deal with evil thoughts. "You cannot prevent evil thoughts", he said, "but you must control them. You cannot forbid the birds to fly over your head; but you can help them from building nests in your hair".

In the university library at Erfurt Luther had for the first time seen a complete Bible. This does not mean that the Bible was absolutely a sealed book, for it had been printed in Latin and German, and there were many learned men who were familiar with its contents; but to Luther, whose studies had taken a different channel, its discovery was a real revelation. In the convent he continued to study the sacred book in connection with the writings of the mystics, John Tauler, Thomas á Kempis, and the unknown author of the *Theologia Germanica*. He also read the writings of Erasmus, whom he recognized as the greatest scholar of his age, though he did not like his humorous treatment of sacred things. In a letter, written as early as 1516, he expressed the fear that Erasmus had little experience of the grace of God.

It was during this period of trial that the light began to break upon Luther's troubled soul. "As I meditated day and night", he says, "upon the words: 'For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith', I perceived that the

righteousness of God is that through which the just man through God's goodness lives—that is to say *faith.* On this I felt as if I were born again, and seemed to be entering through the opening portals of paradise".

Years passed before this principle was fully developed. For the present Luther remained a monk, devoutly attached to Rome, and ready to believe every mediæval fable. Staupitz was, however, convinced that he deserved a broader career than the convent afforded him, and, in 1510, secured for him an opportunity of visiting Rome as a representative of his order. This, too, was necessary to prepare him for his mighty work. His mind was full of romantic ideas concerning the eternal city and God's vice-gerent who ruled in Cæsar's place. Rome was to him, as Jerusalem was to the ancient Israelite, the joy of the whole world; he turned to it in prayer as the Mohammedan turns to Mecca. When he approached the holy city, he burst forth in an enthusiastic apostrophe; and it seemed to him as if the noble army of martyrs were streaming forth from the sacred gates to bid him welcome. He did not dream that he was visiting a city where faith was dead and heathenism reigned supreme. In his enthusiasm he visited all the holy places, saw all, and believed all; but as he ascended the Holy Staircase on his knees the words once more flashed on his mind: "The just shall live by faith".

It was not long before the devout young German was made to feel that his devotion was the object of ridicule. Julius II.—known in history as "the fighting pope"—was on the throne: a man of immense ability, who cared for nothing so much as to advance the temporal power of the papacy. Not as scandalous as his predecessor, Alexander VI., the Borgia; not as skeptical as his successor, Leo X., the Medici; his thoughts were of battles, and his words breathed blood and desolation. "His great artist, Michael Angelo," says Michelet, "represents him conferring his blessing on Bologna like a Jupiter hurling thunderbolts." When he spoke of religion at all it was with a covert sneer which rendered his sincerity doubtful. There is a story that one of the cardinals had insulted Michael Angelo, who took his revenge by painting him among the condemned in his picture of the Last Judgment in the Sistine chapel. The likeness was unmistakable and the cardinal hastened to the pope to demand the punishment of the presumptuous artist. "Well!" said Julius drily, "the case is difficult. If he had put you in purgatory I might have taken you out, by virtue of my holy office; but since you are in hell I am afraid you will have to stay there; no pope's authority extends so far." And there he has remained to this day.

Michelet says: "Paganism has ever existed in Italy; there despite every effort even nature is

pagan, and art follows nature, a glorious comedy, tricked out by Raphael and sung by Ariosto."

If ever the essential paganism of Italy was fully illustrated it was at the time of Luther's visit to Rome. Humanism had alienated the priests and people from the simple faith of Christ, though they were still inclined to attach a sort of magical efficacy to the grand ceremonials of the church. Priests there were who thought it very funny to say in the mass, at the moment of consecration, "*Panis es et panis manebis*" ("Bread thou art and bread thou shalt remain"), and if they happened to allude to divine grace they called it "the favor of the immortal gods." At their banquets they freely joked concerning matters which Christians have always regarded with religious awe, and irreligious witticisms were greeted with the loudest applause.

That Luther was disgusted with such talk goes without saying. This fact may have been observed by the Roman ecclesiastics, and they may have amused themselves in his presence by making things appear worse than they really were. When Luther subsequently related stories concerning the morals of Rome which seem to have been derived from the Decameron of Boccaccio, we are inclined to think that the Romans had been practicing on his credulity. He was himself full of the richest humor; but this was a kind of humor which he could not understand. A French writer says:

"Luther quitted Rome at the end of a fortnight, bearing with him into Italy the condemnation of Italy and of the church. In his rapid and saddening visit the Saxon had seen enough to enable him to condemn, too little to allow him to comprehend. And, beyond a doubt, for a mind preoccupied with the moral side of Christianity, to have discovered any religion in that world of art, law and policy which constituted Italy would have required a singular effort of philosophy." "I would not," Luther somewhere says, "have missed seeing Rome for a hundred thousand florins. I should ever have been uneasy lest I had done injustice to the pope."

In 1512 Luther was called to a professorship of Theology in the university which the Elector Frederick, surnamed "The Wise," had founded in the town of Wittenberg. He did not desire to accept the call, but Staupitz persuaded him. Ten years later he said: "If I had then known what I know now, ten horses should not have drawn me into this professorship."

The Elector Frederick had founded his university on liberal principles and was very anxious for its prosperity. It was the only university where an oath of obedience to the pope was not exacted. The Elector himself was a pious Catholic, but was also a friend of honesty and fair play. Having taken Luther under his protection he never withdrew his favor; though curiously enough, he seems

never to have made his personal acquaintance, and possibly never saw him, except on the memorable occasion of his defense at the diet of Worms. Frederick was the most powerful prince in Germany, and on the death of Maximilian I. he had been for a time regent of the empire and had been offered the imperial crown. He had, however, declined this dignity and had nominated Charles, of Spain, thus gaining the lasting gratitude of that monarch. It was this fact, together with his apparent moderation and impartiality, that enabled Frederick to save the Reformation in Germany. It was not until the end of his life that he received the communion in both kinds, and thus declared himself a Protestant.

For five years Luther preached and taught at Wittenberg, but there was nothing to attract special attention to his work. His lectures on the Psalms were deemed worthy of publication ; he was known to be a promising scholar ; but that was all. Then came the series of events which made him the leader of thousands who had been waiting for such a man. These events are so well known that we venture to rehearse them in the briefest possible manner.

Leo X. had become pope—a prince of the house of Medici—a man of the highest culture ; he could talk Ciceronian Latin, but cared not a straw for religion. He supposed that his reign would be re-

membered in history on account of the great number of antique statues which had been discovered; but he had no idea of what was going on beyond the Alps. Not an immoral man by any means—he was too proud to disgrace himself by common vices—but under his mild rule abuses flourished. Above all things he desired to complete the great basilica of St. Peter's—the crowning glory of the papacy—which had become, as Voltaire said of Versailles, "an abyss of expenses." It occurred to him, or to his advisers, that, if the church had no ready cash, it was believed to be in possession of a treasury of grace which might be dispensed in such a way as to bring a grand return in contributions for the great building. In the Middle Ages it had come to be believed that the church has the power to grant indulgences which involved the remission of the penalties of sin. The forgiveness of sin, it was said, is conditioned on penitence, and indulgences are of use only to those who are truly penitent; but the church holds that even the forgiveness of sin does not remove all the penalties which are due to an offended law. There remain certain penances which must be endured either in this life or in purgatory. These penances the church can remit on the ground of the superabundant merits of Christ and of the saints; and in this assertion we have the ground of the whole system of indulgences. It is in some respects diffi-

cult to understand and may easily be misrepresented. The Germans did not take kindly to it, and Luther said he hardly knew what indulgences were until they were forced upon his attention. In France and some other countries the sale of indulgences was forbidden; but the pope made an agreement with Albert, prince-archbishop of Magdeburg, to sell them all over Germany, and the profits were then to be divided. A Dominican, John Tetzel, a big man with a stentorian voice, traveled in great state from one town to another, and called upon the people to purchase the pope's indulgence, either for themselves or for their deceased friends who were suffering the pains of purgatory. The character of the man has been much discussed, but I think there can be no doubt that he conducted himself like an ordinary mountebank. Darras, a Roman Catholic historian, says: "He tampered with the doctrine he was sent to preach." When he dropped money into the great chest that was standing at his side, he is said to have exclaimed:

> "When in the chest the money rings,
> Out of its pain the spirit springs:

There, there! I see it flying—the soul is flying out of purgatory into heaven."

Unless Tetzel is greatly belied he said worse things than these. Picturing the worst possible crimes in the foulest language, he exclaimed: "Now, if you have committed crimes like these,

all you have to do is to purchase an indulgence." If he added the words "if you have from the heart repented of them" it was in an undertone. It is even said that he sold indulgences for sins about to be committed; and that with such a paper in his pocket one of his penitents robbed his money-chest.

The excitement caused by Tetzel's preaching was intense. The churches were empty, for the people believed that they had found a shorter road to heaven. The priests denounced Tetzel from the altar; the humanists wrote against him in elegant Latin; but the Dominican cared nothing for their opposition. Then it was that Martin Luther—after appealing in vain to his archbishop—on the 31st of October, 1517, affixed his ninety-five theses to the church-door in Wittenberg. They were, in fact, a challenge to the world to discuss the whole question of indulgences. When you examine them now they appear mild; you must read between the lines if you would understand them. Others had said harder things against the pope—others had more clearly proclaimed what is now known as Protestant doctrine—but this was a public, it may be said an official challenge, which even the elegant infidel pope could not fail to heed. It was an act of supreme bravery, and is very properly regarded as the beginning of the German Reformation. He fired the first cannon of the war, and "the shot was heard around the world."

The next few years of Luther's life were occupied by intense struggles. At first the pope was inclined to regard the trouble as of very little importance. "It is nothing but a monkish quarrel," he said; "Brother Martin is a man of genius—let him alone!" When the conflict grew more serious he sent two legates; first, Cardinal Cajetan, an Italian, who insisted on unconditional submission; then, Charles de Miltitz, a Saxon nobleman, who made himself agreeable and induced Luther to write a humble letter to the pope, in which he agreed to submit unreservedly to the decision of the church on condition that his enemies should let him alone. Thus the whole trouble appeared to be settled. Luther's enemies, however, would not let him alone; and, as he says in one of his books, he was so constituted that he could not decline a challenge. Dr. Eck, of Ingolstadt, held a disputation with him at Leipsic; and, as is usual in such cases, both sides claimed the victory. Eck was a man of great learning, thoroughly familiar with canon law, but pompous and pretentious. Luther surprised him by refusing to be bound by the decrees of councils, and fell back on the Scriptures as the only guide of faith and practice. "But who," said Eck, "shall interpret the Scriptures, if not the councils?" Then Luther advanced the second great principle of the Reformation—the principle of private judgment, which has ever since remained its most dis-

tinctive characteristic. The controversy now became acrimonious and personal ; the orators insulted each other in the most outrageous manner, and Luther launched against the pope his most violent philippics.

It was now felt that reconciliation was an impossibility, and the pope at last launched against Luther a bull of excommunication. In earlier times this was a terrible thing ; it had deprived its victims of all civil and social rights ; it meant separation from Christian people—perhaps starvation and a nameless grave. What would Luther do now? His friends trembled, and even the elector was in doubt whether he could any longer protect him. Then it was that Luther did what no one could have anticipated—an act of boldness which for pure audacity was infinitely in advance of the promulgation of the ninety-five theses. He gathered the professors who were favorable to him and the great body of the students, built a bonfire, and—burned the bull. We know how students sometimes amuse or revenge themselves by burning Ovid or Calculus ; and to the students at Wittenberg it afforded great enjoyment to condemn the pope's proclamation to such a fate. They ran all over town to gather mediæval books—Decrees of Councils, Apostolic Constitutions, Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals—and condemned them all to the flames. To the students it was probably pure fun ; and yet they could not

help feeling that by this act they had cast defiance into the face of the pope of Rome. The act accomplished its purpose by its very audacity. Henceforth there could be no more temporizing; the battle must now be fought until it ended in victory or defeat.

It was of great advantage to the Reformation that Luther was now associated with Philip Melancthon. The latter was a native of the Palatinate; a nephew of the celebrated Reuchlin, and himself, next to Erasmus, the foremost Greek scholar of his age. Called to a professorship in Wittenberg when he was but twenty-one years of age, he became Luther's chief assistant and most valued friend. Though never ordained to the ministry he became the most eminent theologian of Germany. A man of gentle disposition he exerted his influence to moderate the controversial fierceness of his colleague. He was, however, no mere imitator, but had views of his own which he was not afraid to defend. Luther wrote, in 1529: "I prefer the books of Master Philippus to my own. I am rough, boisterous, and altogether warlike. I am born to fight against innumerable monsters and devils. I must remove stumps and stones, cut away thistles and thorns, and clear the wild forests; but Master Philippus comes along softly and gently, sowing and watering with joy, accord-

ing to the gifts which God has abundantly bestowed upon him."

"Without Luther," says Dr. Schaff, "the Reformation would never have taken hold of the common people; without Melancthon it would never have succeeded among the scholars of Germany." Occasionally the two men did not perfectly harmonize. "Our doctor," said Melancthon, after Luther's death, "found it difficult to think well of any one who did not fully agree with him."

With every conflict Luther grew stronger. He wrote books in which he called the pope "Antichrist"—not personally, as he was careful to explain, but as the representative of a system. When reproved for his violence he said, truly enough: "If I speak gently they will not mind me." He was a terrible controversialist, but he was gentle to the fallen. There was withal in his nature a deep under-current of poetry that refreshed and beautified the waste places of life. Where in all literature can we find an author who has said so many original, so many wonderful things? His hymns were written amid intense struggles, but even his enemies cannot deny that for grandeur of diction and unconditional trust in God they are unequalled in the history of song. In all Christian hymnology there is nothing grander than the Marseillaise of the Reformation, "*Ein feste Burg.*" He did not always stand on the heights of poetic inspiration; but was

sometimes depressed to the verge of despair. Then suddenly a humorous story occurred to him, and he burst forth in laughter loud and long. Would not the bow have snapped if it had not been occasionally unbent?

Luther's appearance before the diet of Worms concludes the heroic period of his life. The young emperor had at last, in 1521, summoned the Reformer to appear before the princes and prelates to give an account of his doctrine. He sent him a safe-conduct; but the world had not forgotten how in the case of John Huss a similar document had been disregarded. To the everlasting honor of Charles be it said that he was no Sigismund. He was an intense Roman Catholic, though with a leaning towards a reformation by means of a general council, but he was also a man of honor and kept his word.

To go to Worms was under the circumstances a dangerous matter, though Luther was to a certain extent protected by the elector and had some other influential friends in the diet. On the way he wrote to Spalatin: "I will go to Worms though there should be as many devils there as there are tiles on the house-tops." Franz von Sickingen desired him to stay at his castle, near Worms, where he would be safe; but nothing could turn him from his purpose. On the way to the Diet, it is said, the celebrated general, George Frunds-

berg, the leader of the "Free Lances," touched him on the shoulder and said: "Monkling, monkling, thou art going to make such a stand as neither I nor any of my companions in arms have ever made in our hottest battles."

At his first appearance before the Diet Luther seemed dazzled by the imperial presence. When required to recant he asked time for consideration. It was at his second appearance that, after defending himself in well-chosen language, he spoke at least in substance the celebrated words: "Here I stand—I cannot do otherwise—God help me!"

There was something sublime in that utterance, and for a time his adversaries appeared to be silenced. Luther was allowed to leave Worms without molestation, though the Diet condemned him and he was put under the ban of the empire. For several days he journeyed homeward undisturbed. He even stopped to visit his relatives at Möhra, and preached in the village church. Then, as they were jogging along the highway, a company of soldiers suddenly rushed out of the forest and, without a word to any one, seized Luther and carried him away. The consternation of his friends was indescribable, and soon all Germany was in a blaze. What had become of Luther? Had he been assassinated—or carried away by brigands—or by the agents of the emperor—or by the inquisition? Men vainly sought for him everywhere, and it was

generally believed that he was dead. One evening, however, a letter which caused universal rejoicing was conveyed to Wittenberg. It was dated at "Patmos" and written in Luther's own unmistakable hand. Now "Patmos," we know, was the island to which St. John had been banished when he beheld his great apocalypse; and the use of the name on this occasion appeared to indicate that Luther was a prisoner at a place where he was permitted to enjoy considerable liberty He had, indeed, been carried away by the confidential agents of the elector to a castle in the Thuringian forest, called the Wartburg. Here he was required to put on the armor of a knight, was called "Knight George," and was supposed to be a relative of the elector. Here in absolute solitude Luther continued his labors; translating the New Testament and doing an immense amount of other literary work. In his solitude he grew nervous, and supposed that he was specially persecuted by Satan. There is no proof that he actually cast his ink-stand at the devil, but it is certain that his doubts and troubles projected themselves as apparitions. More than once the great enemy of souls appeared to him during the night, and he disputed with him until he trembled. Once the devil taunted him with the fact that he was a great sinner. "I knew that long ago," said Luther, "tell me something new. Christ has taken my sins upon

Himself and forgiven them long ago. Now grind your teeth."

I am not surprised to read that Luther beheld apparitions during the period of his sojourn at the Wartburg. His disposition and early training predisposed him to believe that his conflict with the powers of evil was personal ; and he was no doubt fully prepared for visible indications of their presence. If he addressed his great enemy in language that appears coarse and undignified it must be remembered that he was but following the traditions of the cloister and of the mediæval exorcists.

Nine months Luther remained at the Wartburg ; then news came from Wittenberg which would not suffer him to rest. Protestantism had there assumed an ultra form. Carlstadt, one of the pastors, was preaching against Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. According to his theory Christ at the moment of the institution pointed to his own body, and said : "This is my body." This view which was peculiarly offensive to Luther, was not accepted by any other reformer, but it may be regarded as the beginning of the great Sacramentarian controversy. Simultaneously a fanatical sect, known as "the Zwickan prophets" had established itself in Wittenberg. They were preaching strange doctrines, such as community of goods, opposition to civil government, and the personal inspiration of their leaders. Luther was convinced that if these

fanatics were suffered to continue unrebuked his own work would be irretrievably ruined, and he, therefore, immediately returned to Wittenberg.

On the way Luther was met at a wayside inn by two Swiss students, one of whom (John Kessler) has left a description of his personal appearance. He says: "When I saw Martin in the year 1522 he was pretty stout, of upright bearing, bending more backwards than forwards, with elevated countenance, and deep black eyes, sparkling and flashing like a star, penetrating to the very soul of the beholder." Not less than a dozen cotemporary writers have spoken of the wonderful eyes of the Reformer, but not a single artist has been able to catch their expression.

When Luther returned to Wittenberg he preached eight days in succession, but by the end of that time the power of the fanatics was broken. "When they left Wittenberg," he says, I warned *their* God not to work any miracles against my God, and thus we separated."[1]

At this period Luther's star stood at the zenith and his courage was unbounded. Henry VIII., king of England, wrote a book against him—the "Defense of the Seven Sacraments"—for which the pope rewarded him with the title of "Defender of the Faith." In reply Luther read him such a lecture as had never before been addressed to

(1) Köstlin's "Life," p. 250.

royalty. He called him "a crowned donkey" and heaped upon him the most abusive epithets.[2] Afterwards when there was a chance of gaining Henry VIII. for the Reformation, Luther was anxious to make friends, but the king haughtily refused. It was well that Luther's purpose was not accomplished, for the English despot got no more than he deserved, and could not have touched the Reformer's work without defiling it.

It was in the year 1525 that the event occurred which Luther regarded as the most important in his career. It was in the midst of the terrors of the Peasant War that he surprised his friends by marrying a poor nun of noble descent, Catharine von Bora. He said he did it "to please his father, to tease the pope, and to vex the devil." His highest motive was to rescue the ordinance of marriage from the degradation into which it had fallen, and to vindicate the freedom of the evangelical clergy.

It has been remarked as a curious fact that most of the Reformers, though themselves of humble extraction, chose brides from the nobility. The reason is not far to seek ; there was in those days little or no culture among the women of the humble classes, and educated men naturally sought suitable companions. I do not regard these marriages, as some have done, as indicating a desire on the part

(2) Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," vol. 6, p. 397.

of the Reformers to strengthen their position by alliances with the aristocracy.

Luther's married life was exceptionally happy. His wife was rather proud, and he playfully called her "My lord Katie." A year after his marriage he wrote to a friend: "Catharine, my dear rib, salutes you. She is, thanks be to God, in excellent health. She is gentle and obedient beyond my hopes. I would not exchange my poverty for the wealth of Crœsus." When children gathered around his table his happiness increased, and nothing could be more charming than the letters which he wrote to his wife and children when absent from home.[1]

(1) The following letter, which Froude calls the prettiest ever addressed by a father to a child, was written by Luther to his son Hans, then four years old, in the year 1530:

"Grace and peace in Christ, my dear little boy. I am pleased to see that thou learnest thy lessons well, and prayest diligently. Go on thus, my dear boy, and when I come home I will bring you a fine fairing. I know of a pretty delightful garden, where are many children that have gold frocks, and gather nice apples and pears, cherries and plums, under the trees, and sing and jump and are happy; they also ride on fine little horses with gold bridles and silver saddles. I asked the man who owns the garden, who the children were. He said, 'These are the children who love to pray and to learn and are good.' Then I said, 'Dear man, I also have a son who is called Hans Luther. May he not come to this garden and eat such pretty apples and pears, and ride on such fine little horses, and play with these children?' The man said, 'If he likes to pray and to learn, and is pious he may come to the garden, and Lippus and Jost may come also; and if they all come together, they shall have pipes and drums and lutes and fiddles, and they shall dance and shoot with their cross-bows.'

"Then he showed me a smooth lawn in the garden laid out for dancing, and there hung the golden pipes and drums and cross-bows. But it was still early, and the children had not dined; therefore I could not wait for the dance. So I said, 'Dear sir, I will go straight home and write all this to my little boy; but he has an aunt, Lena, that he must bring with him.' And the man answered, 'So it shall be; go and write as you say.'

"Therefore, dear little boy Johnny, learn and pray with a good heart, and tell Lippus and Jost to do the same, and then you will all come to the garden together. And now I commend you to Almighty God. Give my love to aunt Lena, and give her a kiss for me. Anno 1530.

"Thy loving father,

"MARTINUS LUTHER."

Though Luther was poor his board was always adorned with guests. Several students, to whom he had given a place at his table, took notes of his conversation and may have abused his confidence by publishing the strange book which is known as "Luther's Table Talk." There is much in it that we could wish had remained unwritten ; but it also contains many gems of wisdom and truth.

We have but touched on a few of the main events of Luther's life. There are other occurrences, no less brilliant, which we must pass in silence. His relations to Zwingli will be considered hereafter. His position as a theologian, a poet, an organizer, an educator, even as a statesman, would each demand a separate essay.

There is, however, another side to the picture which demands brief contemplation. Luther was a man, and as such was exposed to the temptations which are common to humanity. There are spots on the sun, and it would be folly to expect immaculate brightness even in the man whom we have ventured to call the Glory of the Reformation.

Let us say, first of all, that we place no confidence in the stories which reflect on Luther's personal character. Erasmus was responsible for some of these, but the controversialists who have utilized them to the utmost do not state that he afterwards confessed that he had been misinformed. Every one of Luther's steps was watched by vigilant

enemies, and if he had been guilty of scandalous conduct it would at any time have been easy to prove it.

The chief defect in Luther's character we conceive to have been almost inseparable from his gigantic strength. The wonderful success that attended his efforts appears to have gradually convinced him that he was right and he alone. In his later years, especially, he might almost have said :

> "I am Sir Oracle
> And when I ope my lips let no dog bark ".

He had so many opponents who sought the destruction of everything which he regarded as good and true, that he included all who did not agree with him in one common condemnation.

To keep the German princes firm in their adhesion to the evangelical cause was no easy matter. Luther was, therefore, almost forced to become a politician, and it is from this point of view that his career is least satisfactory. He resigned the government of the church into the hands of princes, and thus led the way to the system—sometimes called *Cæsareo-papism* which still prevails in Germany. During the Peasant War—though he sympathized with the sufferings of the people—he preached unconditional submission, and even advised that extreme punishment should be inflicted on the rebels—advice which the princes were only

too ready to take. It is true that Luther was consistently opposed to the use of carnal weapons in the advancement of the kingdom of God. At an earlier date Hutten had tried his best to incite him to deeds of violence, and Sickingen and his knights were ready to fight for him at a moment's notice; but he never doubted that those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword, and the event proved that he was right. No doubt the cause of the peasants was hopeless from the beginning; and it may be true that the position taken by Luther saved the cause of the Reformation; but yet we could wish that in those dreadful days the voice of the great Reformer had been heard pleading for mercy.

The presentation of the Augsburg Confession in 1530 may be said to have concluded the formative period of the German Reformation. In later years Luther was chiefly occupied in organizing the church and in promoting the cause of Christian education. He soon, however, manifested signs of physical weakness, and for some years suffered intensely from a complication of diseases. He himself said, in a letter to Amsdorff: "I believe my true malady to be old age; and next to this my overpowering labors and thoughts, but mainly the buffeting of Satan; and all the physic in the world cannot cure me of them. * * * I am weak and weary of life and think of bidding farewell to the

world. May the Lord grant me favorable weather and a happy passage. Amen."

By a strange coincidence Luther died at Eisleben, the village of his birth. He had gone to that place to settle a quarrel between the counts of Mansfeld, to whom, as a native of the territory, he still acknowledged a certain allegiance. During the three weeks which he spent at Eisleben he accomplished the purpose of his journey, preached four times, and revised the ecclesiastical constitution of the county of Mansfeld. Then his strength gave way, and after an illness of two days he died on the 18th of February, 1546. His last words were an acknowledgment that he died in the faith which he had professed and taught. His body was taken to Wittenberg in a metallic coffin, where it was interred with the highest honors at the foot of the pulpit in the Castle church. On his tomb might have been written: "Here lies a man who feared God and God alone."

Our view of the person of Luther has necessarily been incomplete. In his career there are events which we could wish to have been otherwise; but we owe too much to him to occupy the position of antagonists. As Heine says: "The dwarf who stands on the shoulders of the giant can, indeed, see further than the giant, especially if he puts on spectacles; but for that lofty point of intuition we want the lofty feeling, the giant heart, which we

can not make our own." In his personality Luther combines the most colossal antitheses—the gloom of the past with the brilliant activity of the future; but with all these apparent contradictions he must forever remain THE GLORY OF THE REFORMATION.

III.

THE FREE CHURCH IN THE FREE STATE.

ULRIC ZWINGLI.

THE little republic of Switzerland rests like a golden crown on the head of the nations of Europe. The surpassing grandeur of its scenery is universally acknowledged. Its mountains are the highest; its valleys the greenest; its glaciers the grandest; its prospects the most romantic. Grander still to the thoughtful stranger is the spectacle of a simple, unpretentious people, who in the darkness of the middle ages solved the problem of self-government, and for nearly six centuries have boldly defended the rights of man.

As you sail down the lake of Lucerne—directly opposite the great cliff called the Mytenstein, which bears in colossal letters an inscription in honor of Friedrich Schiller whose poetry has glorified all that region—you behold the Rütli, the meadow in the forest where in the night of November 17, 1307, "the three men," Fürst, Stauffacher and Melchthal, each accompanied by ten men of his own canton, solemnly swore, with three fingers uplifted in the name of the Trinity, to defend the freedom of their native land.[1] Within a few weeks of this event, according to tradition,

(1) This "conjuration" was, in fact, a renewal of "the eternal compact," established August 1, 1291.

ULRIC ZWINGLI

occurred the episode of William Tell—the brave hunter who was compelled by the wicked governor, Gessler of Bruneck, to shoot an apple from the head of his son, and who afterwards buried the second arrow in the heart of the tyrant. Historians now discredit the tale, but it is at least expressive of the spirit of the forest cantons. On the first of January, 1308, the Austrian bailiffs were driven out; and it is the boast of Switzerland that this act of emancipation was accomplished without shedding a drop of blood; but two hundred years passed away before independence was actually achieved, and nearly one hundred and fifty more until the Swiss were formally recognized as one of the nations of Europe. During all this time they were almost constantly at war. At Morgarten 1600 Swiss defeated nearly 11,000 Austrians. On several occasions they enticed their enemies into a narrow valley and then rolled down rocks on the heads of the invaders. No nation has a more splendid roll of victories, and Sempach, Laupen, Granson and Morat will never be forgotten. You have heard the story of Arnold Winckelried—how he cast himself upon the line of Austrian spears, crying: "Make way for liberty!" but every conflict was succeeded by another, and after every victory it might have been said:

"Thus Switzerland again was free;
Thus death made way for liberty."

After many fruitless invasions the tyrants were at last convinced that Switzerland could not be conquered, though they kept on growling at the foot of the Alps. The mountains constituted an impregnable fortress and all the power of the empire could not dislodge its garrison. The wants of the people were few. On their high Alpine pastures flocks could safely feed, and the lakes furnished abundance of fish. The whole country might be blockaded, but the Swiss cared little for communication with other nations and could afford to wait until the enemy withdrew.

It was but natural that Switzerland should become a refuge for the oppressed and persecuted. Not only political offenders, but those who had exposed themselves to ecclesiastical censures were glad to escape to the valleys of the Alps. The church of Rome was by law fully established; but on account of the political condition of the country it rarely attempted to press its authority to the utmost extent. Except in the cities the poverty of the people was regarded as an excuse for simplicity of worship, and the Swiss actually came to dislike the splendor of the Italian ritual. Even among the priests there were many who sympathized with the sufferings of the refugees from ecclesiastical tyranny, though they may not have ventured to accept their doctrines.

It was not to be supposed that the kings and nobles of surrounding countries would favorably

regard a country in which their authority was so thoroughly defied. The existence of the Swiss league was a menace to royalty, and the rulers of Europe hated it with perfect hatred. Those of the Swiss who claimed noble descent were contemptuously termed "peasant-nobility," and were not permitted to appear at the imperial court. Among the German peasants the Swiss were sufficiently popular; but in the cities and at the universities the influence of the nobility had caused them to be cordially disliked. Without this feeling, we feel sure, the Germans would have been more ready to coöperate with the Swiss at the beginning of the Reformation, and their doctrinal differences might have been more readily adjusted.

The worst feature in the social condition of the Swiss in the sixteenth century was due to their military system. Every young man was a soldier, and though foreign invasions had apparently ceased, no one could tell how soon they might be renewed. Under these circumstances the cantonal governments conceived the idea of hiring out their soldiers as mercenaries to foreign powers, with the condition that they might be recalled when the safety of the fatherland demanded it. Swiss companies were, therefore, often arrayed on opposite sides, and brother fought against brother.

In this way the Swiss acquired the reputation of being mercenary and avaricious, though no one

doubted their bravery. The worst feature of the system was that the young Swiss were apt to be morally ruined in foreign lands. They brought home vices that spread like a canker in their native valleys. Against this moral evil the Swiss Reformation was at first partially directed, and the movement thus became political as well as ecclesiastical.

The Swiss Reformation was a drama that consisted of two distinct acts. It was synthetic rather than analytic. No single teacher commanded the transcendent influence of the great Saxon reformer; but in each act there was a leading character who impressed his personality on his cotemporaries, and who has exerted an influence through all succeeding ages. The leaders in the successive stages of the Swiss Reformation were Zwingli and Calvin.

ULRIC ZWINGLI, the hero of the first act, was born at Wildhaus on the 1st of January, 1484. His native village is situated in what was then the independent county of Toggenburg, but is now included in the canton of St. Gall. It stands at the head of a mountain valley which extends far into the Alps. The ground is not well suited for agriculture, but there is excellent pasturage. No doubt, the present inhabitants would not hesitate to confess that their outlook is better than their income.

Ulric was the third (some say the youngest) of a family of ten children. His father and grandfather

had held the office of "amman," or local judge; and the family, though unpretentious, was eminently respectable. The house in which they lived is still standing. It is a *chalet* of the better class, with some ornamental wood-carving, but not otherwise remarkable.

Zwingli's father and mother each had a brother who was eminent in the church, and they naturally desired that one, at least, of their children should choose the same vocation.

At an early age it became evident that Ulric was gifted with extraordinary talents. When stories of Swiss heroism were related in the family circle they fell like sparks upon his spirit, and left it glowing with patriotic enthusiasm. Even more profound was the impression made upon his mind by the magnificent scenery that surrounded his birth-place. "I have often thought in my simplicity," wrote his friend Oswald Myconius, long afterwards, "that on those heights, so near to heaven, Zwingli assumed something heavenly and divine. When the thunder rolls along the mountains and the deep abysses are filled with its reverberations, we seem to hear anew the voice of God, saying, 'I am the Almighty God, walk in my presence with reverence and fear.' When with the dawn of morning the glaciers glow with rosy light, and an ocean of fire rolls over the mountain-tops, the Lord of Hosts appears to stand on the high-places of the earth, as

though the hem of His garment glorified the mountains, while we hear the words that were spoken to the prophet Isaiah: 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth. All the earth is full of Thy glory!'"

Ulric was but nine years old when he was given in charge of his uncle Bartholomew Zwingli, who was dean of Wesen. Under his direction he received the best education which the age afforded. The celebrated Lupulus was his teacher, and as he himself said, he learned to speak Latin more fluently than he spoke his mother tongue. He also learned to play all the musical instruments which were then known. The study of Greek he pursued with great enthusiasm, and actually committed the greater part of the New Testament to memory in the original. After thorough preliminary training he took a course at the university of Vienna. Here, after the fashion of the times, he translated his name into Cogitanus; but it was only a student's notion, and he had sense enough to give it up after he left the institution. Then he became a tutor in the Latin school at Basel, at the same time attending the lectures of Thomas Wyttenbach, a celebrated teacher of the university, who was the most effective instrument in preparing the way for the Reformation in Switzerland. In one of his lectures this professor said: "The time is at hand when the ancient faith shall be restored according to the word of God. Indulgences are a Roman

delusion, and the death of Christ is the only ransom for our sins."

At an early age Zwingli was recognized as one of the foremost scholars in Switzerland. He was, however, no scholastic recluse, but a strong and energetic man of the world. The only portrait in existence dates from a later period, when lines of thought and trouble had begun to appear upon his forehead. It was painted by a local artist, and is rather a poor affair; but it confirms the statement of cotemporaries that Zwingli was at this time a model of manly beauty. Taller than most of his countrymen, he was as strong as a Greek athlete and as bold as a lion. He was familiar with the customs of the upper classes, and at first sight his manner appeared somewhat haughty; but when he opened his lips he drew all men to him, for his eloquence was irresistible. He entered the priesthood, apparently without the spiritual conflict through which Luther was called to pass; and it seems to have been his purpose to devote his life chiefly to classical learning. In 1506 he became pastor of a church in Glarus, where he remained ten years, the idol of his people. There was no pretence of extraordinary piety, but he was eminently truthful. In his boyhood he had written in his diary: "Truth is the highest virtue; lying is worse than stealing." He had no secrets, and it seemed as if every one who gazed into his clear

blue eyes could behold the depths of his soul. Twice during this period he accompanied Swiss troops to Italy as a chaplain. Here he saw the wickedness that pervaded the land, and by his own confession was for a time carried away by the prevailing flood of luxury and licentiousness. He caused no scandal, and was regarded as more moral than his associates; but, curiously enough, the universality of wickedness roused him to a sense of imminent danger. About the same time he found an ancient copy of the mass-book and to his great surprise discovered that a few centuries earlier it had been usual to give bread and wine to communicants, instead of bread alone. "Can the church," he asked himself, "which claims to be unchangeable and yet makes such alterations in its liturgy possess the fundamental element of truth?" In brief the contemplation of these elements directed him to the real significance of the Scriptures with whose letter he was already so familiar. The pope had granted him a pension so that he might devote himself entirely to classical study; but the authors of Greece and Rome had lost their zest, the praises of men seemed utter vanity, and like another Moses he renounced the pleasures of the world to devote his life to the deliverance of his people. In later years the tongue of slander did not venture to impugn the sincerity of his motives nor the purity of his life. Even Audin, the most bitter of Roman

Catholic controversialists, who unjustly accuses the other reformers of a lack of sincerity, confesses that Zwingli was thoroughly honest.

In 1516 Zwingli became parish priest of the great convent of Einsiedlen, the center of Romanism in Switzerland. This was regarded as a place of special holiness. Over the portal was the inscription: "Here is complete forgiveness for all possible transgressions." The convent itself is said to have been founded in the tenth century by St. Meinrad, a reputed ancestor of the great house of Hohenzollern. It contained a statue of the Virgin Mary which was said to be miraculous, and more than a hundred thousand pilgrims came annually to worship at its shrine. The abbot, Conrad von Rechberg, was an excellent old man who longed for the reformation of the church. He was the younger son of a noble house, and had been forced into the convent to make room for the advancement of others. Now that he had become a great personage his relatives sued for his favor, but he turned them away and gave his goods to charity. When reproved for refusing to say mass, he said: "Either the host is my God or it is not. If it is my God I am unworthy to look upon him, much less to touch him; if it is not my God I will not lend myself to the dissemination of error."

Under the patronage of this man, Zwingli began to preach the Gospel to the pilgrims of Einsiedlen.

He told them that the blessed Virgin would herself repudiate the worship of her image, and that Christ alone can save the world. Thousands of pilgrims received the word with rejoicing, and returned to their homes bearing the message of a newly-found Gospel.

While thus engaged Zwingli appealed earnestly to the authorities of the church of Rome to make way for the progress of the truth. We have records of his piteous pleadings, in the early part of 1517, with Cardinal Schinner, the Bishop of Constance, and others, assuring them that if the church did not welcome the Gospel it would make way for itself. Instead of accepting this advice the hierarchy committed the blunder—the crime—of attempting to bribe the fearless herald of the truth. When the papal legate was asked what Zwingli might hope to gain if he took the side of the pope, he replied: "He might have anything he asked for short of the papal crown itself." When Zwingli was called to the chief pastorate of the cathedral church of Zurich, it was not in ignorance of his position but because he was already recognized as the leader of the Swiss Reformation.

The question concerning the relative priority of the German and Swiss reformers has frequently been asked but is of little real importance. We may believe Zwingli when he says that he preached the Gospel in 1516 as purely as he ever did in later

years, but so did many of his associates. The Reformation in Switzerland proceeded more quietly than in Germany ; there was no great event to inaugurate it, like the nailing of the theses to the church-door at Wittenberg. Saxony and Switzerland were in those days widely separated, and there is no room to doubt that Zwingli and Luther never knew of each other's existence until long after the most important steps had been taken. Zwingli recognized Erasmus as his chief leader and teacher, though in later life their paths parted. He was inclined to the Humanists ; Luther to the Mystics. Zwingli's movement was at first mainly disciplinary ; Luther was above all things a theologian. Goebel says : "The German Reformation began simultaneously and independently at the opposite extreme of German life and culture—at the Slavonian boundary and at the foot of the Alps—and thence spread until it met at the Rhine, the center of Germanic life."[1]

It could not be otherwise than that the system and organization of the church in Germany and Switzerland should differ widely. In Germany the church was under the control of princes who formally assumed the office of bishop. The Swiss had no love for bishops and were not even enthusiastic in their attachment to the emperor. Zwingli said :

(1) *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens*, 1, p. 275.

"The empire and the papacy, both come from Rome"—he wished the world was well rid of both of them. It may, indeed, be said that even in Switzerland the church was governed by the state in a manner that would prove offensive to modern Americans; but it should be remembered that the state was itself the creation of the people. After the Reformation the Swiss chose their own pastors, while those of Germany were appointed by the government. The organization of the Swiss church was, therefore, thoroughly popular, and we have in Switzerland the first example of the free church in the free state.

On his thirty-sixth birthday (Jan. 1, 1519) Zwingli took charge of the cathedral church of Zurich. He proved himself a faithful pastor, for whom nothing was too insignificant to claim his cordial sympathy. This was especially apparent in 1519, during the prevalence of the great plague. He had gone to the mineral springs at Pfäffers on account of impaired health, but when the plague broke out nothing could keep him from his post. During that dreadful summer 2500 people died in Zurich alone, and Zwingli was almost alone in ministering to the dying and in burying the dead. At last he was himself seized by the pestilence, and it was at one time believed that he could not recover. During his illness he composed a beautiful

hymn in three parts, of which the first has been thus translated:

"Help me, O Lord,
My strength and rock;
Lo, at the door
I hear death's knock.
Uplift Thine arm,
Once pierced for me,
That conquered death
And set me free.

Yet, if Thy voice
In life's mid-day
Recalls my soul,
Then I obey.
In faith and hope
Earth I resign,
Secure of heaven,
For I am thine."

On his recovery Zwingli engaged actively in the reformation of the church. It is often said that his methods were too radical, and in support of this assertion it is urged that he removed works of art from the churches and prohibited singing and the use of the organ.

If you would see the pictures which Zwingli removed from the churches you can do so by visiting the museum at Zurich, where they are still preserved. These works of art (save the mark!) do not represent scriptural scenes or teach religious lessons. They represent, as a rule, mediæval legends which are neither edifying nor instructive. So Zwingli forbade singing, did he? Yes! but

what kind of singing was it? It was nothing but the sing-song of the mass, of which Pope Leo was so ashamed that he seriously considered the propriety of ordering the service to be recited in a natural tone of voice. It was not until the next generation that Palestrina introduced the reforms which allied music to the service of the church of Rome. There were in those days no hymns in the vernacular—even the grand old Latin hymns were merely mumbled in a perfunctory fashion. The nearest approach to the modern hymn may, possibly, be found in the curious macaronic compositions known as *mischlieder*, of which the following stanza, addressed to the Virgin, is a favorable example:

"*Ave maris stella*—Star of the sea;
Tu verbi Dei cella—Glory to thee!
Dei mater alma—God thou didst bear,
Tu virtutum palma—Virgin most fair."

The voice of song was for some time silent in the Swiss churches; but there is evidence to show that a version of the Psalms was in course of preparation when Zwingli died.

As for the organ it was a very different affair from the queen of the instruments with which we are acquainted. It took thirteen men to tread the bellows of the organ in the church at Zurich; it was played with the fists and made a noise like a modern steam calliope. In the next generation

the organ was perfected ; and it is no doubt to be regretted that it was banished by Zwingli, for such was the power of prejudice once established that it was not until the present century that the city of Berne allowed the use of the organ in its parish churches.

In his literary labors Zwingli was greatly aided by Leo Juda, his old friend and schoolmate who had become his assistant in Zurich. This man was the son of a priest in Alsace ; mild and retiring in disposition, but a wonderful literary worker. His relation to Zwingli was very much like that of Melancthon to Luther and of Beza to Calvin. It was supposed from his curious name that he must be a Jewish convert, but this was a mistake. Juda himself supposed that one of his remote ancestors must have been a Jew, but the fact could not be established. He translated the Old Testament into Latin, and was the chief translator of the German version of the Scriptures which appeared in Zurich in 1530, four years before the publication of Luther's complete translation. He also composed many minor works and assisted Zwingli in all his labors.

As for Zwingli himself, in the short space of twelve years he produced eighty German and fifty-nine Latin books, not to mention two posthumous volumes. During the Disputation of Baden, it is said, he did not go to bed for six weeks. He was

not permitted to appear personally at the controversy, because the Catholics insisted that his wonderful eloquence gave the evangelical party an unfair advantage;[1] but Oecolampadius, of Basel, was Zwingli's representative, and at night the delegates journeyed secretly to Zurich to receive instructions. Sometimes the nervous strain became so intense that Zwingli cried out: "Now leave me, all of you, I must play the lute." Then for a while sweet strains of music were heard, but when the troubled spirit was soothed, the delegates were called into the room, and the work went on.

During this time Zwingli's wife was kept busy preparing a collation for her midnight guests. Concerning her personal characteristics little is known, but it is evident that she sought to do her duty as a pastor's wife. The story of her marriage to Zwingli is unusually interesting. She had been a poor girl of good family, intellectual and beautiful. A young nobleman, Meyer von Knonau, had loved and married her; but his proud father refused to recognize the union, and the youthful bridegroom was forced to seek service in foreign lands, where he died leaving one son, Gerold, a pledge of his ill-fated love. The beautiful boy drew all hearts to him, and even his old grand-

(1) Some writers assert that the authorities of Zurich did not permit Zwingli to go to Baden because it had become known that his enemies had formed a plan to assassinate him.

father, when he beheld him, opened wide his arms. The young widow and her son were now recognized by their relatives, and Gerold was happy. To this boy Zwingli was irresistibly attracted; and for him he drew up rules of education which were long afterwards observed in the Swiss schools. It was the boy who introduced Zwingli to his mother, and in due time she became his faithful help-mate. Though her labors were mainly domestic she held women's meetings and taught the poor to sew. Four children blessed her second marriage. The eldest daughter, Regula, used to say in later years that the most she remembered concerning her father was that in the evening he played the lute and joined with her mother in singing spiritual songs of his own composition. The family life was earnest and solemn. There was none of the table-talk that has rendered the home-life of Luther so interesting to subsequent generations.

During the twelve years which Zwingli spent in Zurich he was almost constantly engaged in religious controversy. His conflicts with the Roman Catholics were in his judgment less violent than others in which he was subsequently engaged. When the monk Samson—another Tetzel—came to Zurich, a few sermons by Zwingli induced him to drive away towards Italy "in a wagon drawn by three horses and loaded with gold." The sale of indulgences in Switzerland was a mere episode, not an epoch as it

had been in Germany. There were extreme Catholics who were bitterly opposed to Zwingli's methods, and his life was several times attempted; but it seemed as if Rome had for the time been paralyzed. It took some time before the old man of the Vatican could pull on his boots.

According to Zwingli's own statements his disputations with the Romanists were but child's play compared with his contests with the Anabaptists. We have already met with these people in Wittenberg; now they came to Switzerland for the purpose of setting up their new Jerusalem. Münzer and Carlstadt were there with the avowed intention of fighting Zwingli. Carlstadt after a while sobered down; but Münzer, with his learning and fanatical enthusiasm, was a dreadful antagonist. Accompanying these leaders was a multitude of uneducated fanatics, dressed in peculiar garments, and marching through the streets, crying aloud: "Woe! Woe! Woe unto Zurich!" "For a time," says Ebrard, "it seemed as if the whole evangelical church of Switzerland had gone over to the Anabaptists, and Zwingli was left to fight them single-handed."

It might naturally be supposed that the question of infant baptism was the main subject of discussion; but all authorities agree that this was in fact a minor matter—a sort of badge of distinction that did not really touch the main questions at issue.

The fact is that these enthusiasts taught that God's people must always expect to be led by divine inspiration—that the teachings of the Bible need to be supplemented by constant revelations. The way was thus opened for all sorts of fanatics who believed or pretended that their extravagant utterances were divinely inspired. The leaders were in some instances political adventurers who employed the credulity of their followers for their personal advantage. They were extreme socialists who announced the establishment of a new Israel; and that they would rather have attempted to found it in Switzerland than in Germany goes without saying. They called Zwingli "the great dragon" and would know him by no other name. Once, in 1525, a great multitude of these people came rushing into the *hotel de ville*, shouting, "Rejoice, rejoice Jerusalem," and demanding the adhesion of Zurich to the truth. The council called a meeting in the cathedral, and Zwingli was required to meet them in debate. When the wild crowd saw the great Protestant leader they hesitated, and for some time none of them had a word to say. At last a rude, ignorant peasant rose and said: "Zwingli, I adjure thee, by the living God, to tell me but a single word of truth." Quick as a flash Zwingli replied: "I will do that. I tell thee that thou art one of the most ignorant and rebellious country-bumpkins in all Switzerland."

The controversy soon began in a more serious manner, and continued three days; but then the power of the Anabaptists was broken. Several of their leaders subsequently engaged in political conspiracies, and rendering themselves amenable to the laws were executed at Zurich. Zwingli had been accused of sanctioning these extreme measures; but his most reliable biographers (Christoffel, Grobe, and Schaff) insist that he counselled more lenient action. There can, however, be no doubt that the strong stand taken by the city council of Zurich saved Switzerland from becoming the center of the Peasant War.

Zwingli's meeting with Luther at Marburg, in 1529, has frequently been represented as the occasion which separated the two great churches of the Reformation. Far from this being the case it may confidently be affirmed that it brought them nearer together than they were ever before or afterwards. Up to this time the Protestants of Germany had been intensely prejudiced against Zwingli and the Swiss. Many people believed that they denied the Trinity and that they secretly worshipped Mohammed. Luther knew better than this; but he was bitterly opposed to the Swiss because they did not fully agree with him concerning the nature of the person of Christ and of the sacraments. To him the Lord's Supper was in a pre-eminent degree the *sanctum sanctorum* of worship; and its shechinah

was the corporal presence of the Lord. Zwingli, on the other hand, regarded the sacraments as signs and seals of a grace already received. He recognized the divine presence in the sacramental service; but it was a presence that declares and confirms the thing signified, that it does not create it. We do not understand him as teaching that the Lord's Supper is simply a memorial service; but that it is the means by which heavenly graces are conveyed to the believing heart.

"Luther," says Baur, "had made no distinction between Zwingli and the Anabaptists; to him they were all 'Sacramentarians.'" At this time his prejudices were intensified by political conditions. Philip of Hesse had conceived the idea of uniting the Protestants in opposition to the imperial power which was enlisted on the Catholic side. He wrote more than thirty letters on the subject; and there can be no doubt that he had consulted with Zwingli with a degree of freedom that might by the emperor have been construed as treasonable. In pursuance of his purpose Philip was very anxious to bring the leaders of the Reformation into personal contact, and accordingly arranged for a meeting and conference. Luther and Melancthon did not desire to attend it; but the Elector of Saxony directed them to go and so they went. They must, however, have appreciated the fact that an intimate alliance with the republican Swiss would have a tendency

to alienate the princes of Germany on whose protection they so greatly depended.

The Reformers met at Marburg on the first day of October, 1529. The facts of the meeting are well known and it is hardly necessary to relate them in detail. First there was a discussion between Luther and Oecolampadius, and another between Zwingli and Melancthon, and it was unexpectedly found that these teachers were more nearly agreed than any one had imagined. It was when Zwingli and Luther were brought together to discuss the sacraments that the disagreement became evident. Luther took a piece of chalk and wrote on the table: "This is my body," and at every turn of the argument he pointed to the words. Zwingli proved himself an able debater and kept his temper throughout. He was extremely courteous—perhaps a little too much so—a little condescending, in fact; but taking all together it was decidedly the most gentlemanly discussion of the period of the Reformation. It was far too brief; for a dangerous disease—the sweating sickness—had broken out in Marburg, and both parties were anxious to leave the town.

At the conclusion of the conference Luther, at Philip's request, drew up articles of agreement, which were signed by all the reformers. You will find their signatures reproduced in *fac simile* in Schaff's latest volume. This author says: "In

fourteen out of fifteen articles they agreed fully, and even in the fifteenth they agreed in the principal part, namely, the spiritual presence and fruition of Christ's body and blood, differing only in regard to corporal presence and oral manducation, which the one denied and the other asserted." "Even on this point," says Oswald Myconius, Zwingli's friend and biographer, "I feel convinced that the two men did not fully understand each other." "Zwingli, with his rationalizing mind, could not understand that from Luther's point of view there is a sacramental eating which is not physical nor carnal. Luther did not give credit to Zwingli for believing that spiritual communication is real and true."

Considering the fact that both reformers signed the articles it is not easy to see why Luther refused to give Zwingli the right hand of fellowship, though he pleaded for it with tears. He said: "Ye have a different spirit from ours;" and there can be no doubt that it was the spirit, rather than the letter, in which they chiefly disagreed. It must not be understood that there was any lack of social courtesy. Luther wrote, immediately after the conference: "We have become good friends and will help each other." Nine years later he wrote to Bullinger that he had found Zwingli a most excellent man (*vir optimus*), though in the next year he once more attacked the "Sacramentarians."

Melancthon, however, remained faithful to the Marburg agreement to the end of his life.

The peculiar spirit of the Swiss churches became apparent in their organization. Luther had, indeed, pleaded for the freedom of the churches; but the princes at once assumed control, and the churches of the several countries were governed by a bureau or "Consistorium," as one of the departments of the civil service. In Switzerland, as we have seen, the legislature also assumed supreme direction; but it was itself a popular body, and the organization was effected in accordance with the will of the people. It was Zwingli who first appointed laymen to office in the church; it was he who convened the earliest Protestant synod. Calvin, it is true, receives greater credit in the matter of organization, but he was simply working in the same line. May I venture to remind you that it was the strong popular organization of the Reformed churches that enabled them to defend themselves successfully in days of persecution? In a broader sense it may be said, that it is in the countries which followed the example of Switzerland that we find the grandest manifestations of self-sacrifice in the cause of civil liberty. Holland derived her ideals from Switzerland, and our own country would hardly have assumed its present form of government if Holland and Switzerland had not led the way. The congregational meeting led

to the town meeting; the classis, or presbytery, to the legislature; and the synod to congress.

That Zwingli was a patriot and statesman we have already intimated. When his statue was erected in Zurich a few years ago Catholics contributed freely; not, they said, on ecclesiastical grounds, but because he was the foremost citizen of Switzerland.

Zwingli was cut down in the prime of his manhood and left much of his work unfinished. He fell on the battlefield, October 11, 1531, aged forty-seven years, nine months and eleven days. He was not the cause of the war which resulted in his death; he did not use his weapons on the field of battle; but as the chief pastor of Zurich he was by law required to accompany its army.

It was a shameful, fratricidal war. The Catholic cantons had maltreated Protestants, and the Protestants refused to trade with them. It was an actual blockade, and the Catholics determined to avenge themselves by attacking Zurich. Eight thousand crossed the frontier, and the army of defense numbered not more than from fifteen hundred to nineteen hundred men. The Zurichers fought bravely at Cappel but were overpowered, and Zwingli was mortally wounded. His last words were: "What does it matter? They may kill the body, but they cannot kill the soul."

After the battle Zwingli was found by the enemy lying on the field. He was still conscious but unable to speak. To a question, whether he desired the services of a priest he replied by a negative gesture. Then a soldier recognized him, and Captain Vokinger of Uri, killed him with his sword. A Catholic priest, named Schönbrunner, who had been one of Zwingli's chief opponents, burst into tears as he passed the body, and exclaimed: "Whatever may have been thy faith, thou has been an honest patriot. May God forgive thy sins."

The fanatics and mercenaries did not even spare the dead. They decreed that Zwingli's body should be quartered for treason and then burned for heresy; and the barbarous sentence was executed by the sheriff of Luzerne. But what did it matter? They could not kill the soul.

The death of the Protestant leader spread terror and gloom. There is a poem—"Frau Zwingli's Lament"—which speaks of the inexpressible grief of Zwingli's wife. Her husband was dead, and Gerold her son, and, it is said, more than a dozen of her nearest relatives. Zwingli left no property, except a few books and a little furniture, and his family was entirely destitute. Then it was that his successor in the pastorate, Henry Bullinger, came to the rescue; he and his wife received the

widow and the fatherless and cared for them until their support was no longer needed.

Zwingli does not belong to a single branch of the Church of Christ. The religious movement in which he was so prominent extended to many countries, and gave birth to a series of national Reformed churches. His dying words have proved a prophecy that is abundantly fulfilled. From an early period the chosen emblem of the Reformed churches has been the burning bush which Moses saw on Horeb. It has been frequently enveloped by the flames of persecution, but it is still green and flourishing. The external form may change, but the inner life no fire can burn, no flood can drown. "They may kill the body, but they can not kill the soul."

IV.

THE CHURCH UNDER THE CROSS.

JOHN CALVIN.

THE city of Geneva was in the sixteenth century sometimes termed "the Protestant Rome." Though the term was very properly repudiated by Protestants there was a point of view from which it was not entirely undeserved. Like the ancient capital of the Cæsars, Geneva was recognized as the meeting-place of nationalities. Situated in what is now the south-western corner of Switzerland, within a few hours journey of the French frontier, and almost as near to Italy, its geographical position, no less than the diversified character of its population, rendered it especially well suited to be the center of a religious movement embracing many nations.

Surely there is no more beautiful place in all the world. Standing on both sides of the river Rhone where its turbulent flood pours forth from Lake Leman—within sight of the snow-clad summit of Mont Blanc—it is a city of which Luther might have said: "If it were not for sin I should delight to dwell forever in this Paradise."

For this pearl of the Alps neighboring princes had struggled for generations. Originally the city had been jointly governed by a bishop and a count of the empire. On this account the coat-of-arms

JOHN CALVIN

of the city represented a shield parted *per pale*, with a key on one side and half an eagle on the other. The people, however, playfully said that it represented half a turkey and the key to the wine-cellar; and there can be no doubt that the general reputation of the city was greatly in favor of this interpretation.

Charles III., duke of Savoy, had secured the appointment of one of his relatives, Pierre de la Baume, as bishop of Geneva, and by his aid had seized and for some time held the city. The bishop was popularly regarded as a traitor, and his conduct did much to undermine episcopal authority in Geneva. Among those who incurred the enmity of the Duke was Bonnivard, who was for eight years chained to a pillar in a dungeon, and has been immortalized by Byron as the Prisoner of Chillon.

There was a protracted conflict between two parties which were arrayed against each other in bitterest opposition. The one party, which favored annexation to Switzerland, was called *Eidgenossen*, or confederates, a name which the Swiss have always applied to themselves. The opposing party was termed Mamelukes, which in those days meant slaves, because they were regarded as the slaves of the duke of Savoy.

In 1526 the patriotic party triumphed and Geneva was united with Switzerland, not at first as a

canton but as an allied district—"*ein zugewandter Ort.*" These new political relations negatively prepared the way for the introduction of the Reformation in its Swiss form. It is true that the pioneers were Frenchmen, but they labored under the patronage of the Swiss churches.

During the years immediately succeeding the death of Zwingli the churches of German Switzerland had been greatly discouraged; but the losses resultant from the battle of Cappel were more than retrieved by the conversion of the French cantons of Vaud, Neufchatel and Geneva. The pioneer in this work was William Farel, who was vigorously seconded by Peter Viretus.

Farel has been termed "The Elijah of the French Reformation." He was a Frenchman of noble descent who had been converted by Lefevre des Etaples, "the father of Protestantism in France." In his youth, Farel tells us, he had been "more popish than the pope;" but when he became a Protestant he did it with all his heart. Driven from France he became a traveling evangelist who did more to break way for the Gospel than any other of his cotemporaries. His associates describe him as a perfect firebrand. Oecolampadius, the reformer of Basel, warned him that his mission was "to preach the Gospel and not to curse the pope." Farel might have retorted in the words of Lavengro: "Go to! Go to, old man! Did you

ever hear the pope curse?" Even Zwingli warned him that his life was too precious to be sacrificed by acts of imprudence. Farel, however, was not the man to take advice on such a subject. He went straight on and accomplished what the world accounted impossibilities. To Geneva he went on his own responsibility, rented a house, and in it preached to all who came. One day, on the street, he met a priest carrying relics; in his enthusiasm he took them away from him by force and threw them into the river. This is but an example of his violent methods, and we are hardly surprised to learn that he was kicked and buffeted, and finally thrown out of the city. In a few days he returned, armed with letters of recommendation from Bern, and began to preach with redoubled energy and power. Such enthusiasm was irresistible and on the 27th of August, 1535, the Great Council of Geneva formally introduced the Reformation, and the citizens pledged themselves to live in accordance with the precepts of the Gospel. The mass was abolished and forbidden; images and relics were removed from the churches. A school was founded which afterwards grew into an important literary institution. Daily sermons were preached in the principal churches; the communion after the simple manner of Zurich was ordered to be celebrated four times a year. All shops were closed on Sunday; and discipline was so minute that it even

prescribed how brides should wear their hair. These strict regulations aroused opposition, and there was great confusion throughout the city.

In the midst of the prevailing disorder, in the latter part of August, 1536, John Calvin arrived in Geneva. He was on his way to Basel, where he proposed to devote himself to humanistic studies, and took lodgings at an inn for a single night. He supposed himself unknown, but was recognized by an acquaintance, Louis du Tillet, who at once conveyed the news to Farel. With almost prophetic insight the latter appreciated the fact that the man and the hour had come, and immediately sought the stranger at his inn. With all the earnestness of his nature Farel exhorted him to take charge of the work in Geneva. Calvin shrank back; he desired to live a quiet life in the midst of the storms of the age. When Farel found that he could accomplish nothing by way of entreaty he burst forth in words of the sternest reproof. He threatened Calvin with the curse of Almighty God, if he preferred his personal convenience to the work of the Lord—declaring that he would himself be his accuser at the bar of judgment. Calvin—that cold, unimpressive man—confesses that he was terrified by the words of the stern evangelist; he felt "as if God Himself had stretched forth His hand to hold him there."

Refusing to hold official position, Calvin agreed to remain in Geneva and to help where he could. He was, indeed, the chief pastor of the city, but there is no record of his formal ordination.

Hitherto the life of John Calvin had not been peculiarly eventful. He was born, July 10, 1509, at Noyon, sixty-seven miles from Paris. His father, Gerárd Cauvin—whose name according to the fashion of the times was Latinized into Calvinus—occupied a prominent position as a notary and secretary to the bishop of Noyon. His mother, Jeanne Lefranc, or Francke, is said to have been of German descent. Recently discovered documents render it probable that the father accepted Protestantism before the son; and, indeed, the whole family was suspected of liberalism.

John Calvin received his earliest education in company with the children of the noble family of Mommors. At first it was expected that he would study for the priesthood; and he was in part supported by the revenues of a chaplaincy. Afterwards, in accordance with his father's wishes, he studied law; but he was so profoundly interested in religious questions that "he studied law by day and theology at night." He did not, however, neglect his legal studies; for, as Ancillon says, he became "the greatest theologian of his age and the greatest lawyer of any age." He received an ex-

cellent education, studying successively at the leading French universities, Orleans, Bourges, and Paris. From his favorite teacher, Cordatus, he acquired so thorough a knowledge of Latin that he has been termed "the best Latinist since Cicero." His fellow-students said he was "all Logic and Latin;" and in the absence of the regular professors he was frequently called upon to give instruction in these branches. He bore the reputation of being stern and critical, and his companions nicknamed him "the accusative case." With all this he was not destitute of devoted friends who remained attached to him to the end of life. One of his teachers was Melchior Wolmar, a German, who was a decided Protestant, but whether he exerted any direct influeuce on Calvin's convictions is not certainly known.

The religious condition of France was at this time confused and discouraging. There was much Protestant feeling but no general organization. D'Aubigne is no doubt right in saying that the French Reformation was, in part at least, of indigenous origin. The church of France had always insisted on "Gallican liberties," and had produced some of the most eminent of the so-called "Reformers before the Reformation." Here such men as John Gerson, Pierre D'Ailly, and the abbots of St. Victor had lifted up their voices in behalf of

the righteousness to which their age had become a stranger. They had never forgotten the days of Philip le Bel, when the pope dwelt in Avignon and the kings of France dictated the policy of the papal court. To the people of France the exalted pretensions of the Roman curia appeared absurd; and the higher classes, at least, simply refused to submit to the tyranny which was elsewhere so oppressive. It became the fashion to ridicule priests and monks, and the literature of the times is filled to overflowing with stories of their stupidity and lewdness. As early as 1512 Lefévre des Etaples began to deliver sledge-hammer blows against the hierarchy. Bricounet, bishop of Meaux, and other prelates, rejoiced for a time in what they regarded as the dawning of a new era. At first it seemed as if all France would accept the Reformation. The king's sister, Margaret of Navarre, became the patron of Protestants, and most of the leading nobility declared themselves in their favor. Young men of the highest rank paraded the streets singing Protestant psalms, and ladies of the court sought out the obscure meeting-places of the Huguenots to hear the word of God. For a while it was believed that the king himself would take the side of the Reformers—he despised the priests and hated the machinations of the Italian party; but Francis I. appears to have been almost destitute of religious impulses. His strongest passion

was his desire for the aggrandizement of the royal power; and next to that a longing to be avenged on those of the great nobility who had stood in the way of his ambition. When, therefore, the Sorboune, in 1521, issued a declaration against the doctrine of Luther, and it became evident that the French people would not generally accept the Reformation, he issued an edict forbidding the practice of new forms of religion. At this time he uttered his famous dictum: "*Un roi, un loi, un foi*"—"One king, one law, one faith." To a modern observer it seems as if the king had chosen the occasion to gain the support of the common people in his conflict with the great nobles of the realm.

The Protestants could not safely contradict a royal proclamation; but some of them very foolishly printed placards denouncing the mass, and one of these was found affixed to the door of the king's bed-chamber. The king was now thoroughly alarmed, and the pope's legate found it easy to persuade him that the introduction of new forms of faith must necessarily involve a change in the royal dynasty. The influence of his sister could no longer restrain him, and at his direction seven Protestants were executed under circumstances of the most revolting cruelty.

After this event the cause of Protestantism in France was greatly depressed. Many of the Pro-

testant leaders fled from the country, and those who remained could discover no better way of preserving their faith than by organizing local societies which were known by such fanciful names as "The Rose," "The Lily," or "The Olive." These societies held public meetings which were devoted to literature and music; but after the strangers had withdrawn the members strengthened each other in their faith. It was at this time that French Protestants began to call themselves "The Church under the Cross;" though they were popularly known as "Huguenots"—a term which has been variously interpreted, but had probably originated in Geneva by the mispronunciation of the term "*Eidgenos*," or "confederate," as applied to the party which was devoted to Swiss interests.

"The darkest hour is just before the dawn." At this time it began to be whispered that John Calvin—who was already distinguished as a scholar—had accepted the Gospel. Calvin himself tells us that, in 1533, he was suddenly converted; but he has not related the circumstances and we must remain in ignorance. Immediately afterwards he began to preach in secret, encouraging the hearts of those who were ready to faint.

In the previous year Calvin's first literary work had appeared. It was a commentary on the treatise of the Roman philosopher Seneca on "Clemency." It has been supposed that it was intended

to move the king to clemency; but there is nothing in the book to indicate that this was the author's intention. Its undeniable learning, however, gained him the respect of the educated classes, and thus prepared the way for his subsequent work.

In October, 1533, the public rupture occurred. An eminent physician, Nicholas Cop, had been elected rector of the university of Paris; and as he was not skilled in literary composition he induced Calvin to assist him in preparing his inaugural address. Calvin made it a plea for the reformation of the church, and, perhaps unintentionally inserted doctrinal statements which were deemed objectionable. The authorship of the address was discovered, and both Calvin and Cop were forced to flee for their lives. There is a tradition that Calvin was aided by his friends to escape through a window, and that he fled from Paris disguised as a vine-dresser, with a hoe upon his shoulder. For three years Calvin was a wandering evangelist. For some time he was protected by Margaret of Navarre, but was finally compelled to seek a refuge in Normandy, where he is said to have hid himself in a cave which is still called "Calvin's cave." Finally he escaped to Basel, where he was kindly received. Here, after some minor literary labor he published, in 1536, the Latin edition of his great work, "The Institutes of the Christian Religion." The French edition did not appear until 1541.

This was the greatest theological work of its age, perhaps of any age. As the composition of a young man of twenty-six it was marvellous. Most wonderful of all is the fact that though Calvin published many editions of his book, and made constant additions, he seems never to have changed his mind in a single particular.

The ruling principle of Calvin's "Institutes," as their author expressed it, was "the utter destruction of human glory that God might be all in all." This principle, as he developed it, gave rise to the system which is known as "Calvinism," though in ordinary usage the term is not always properly applied. Predestination, it need hardly be said, is but a part of Calvinism, and it may perhaps be termed the feature which was originally least distinctive. On this subject there was no serious disagreement among the early reformers, and even the church of Rome did not condemn the Protestant doctrine while Calvin lived. In this respect it was the spirit of Augustine that ruled the Reformation. On the continent of Europe it is Calvin's doctrine of the sacraments which is most generally known as "Calvinism."

From a literary point of view the "Institutes" were a marvel. "Two men," it has been said, "formed the modern French language—John Calvin and Francois Rabelais: the one a Christian Stoic, the other a heathen Epicurean; the one rep-

resenting discipline bordering on tyrrany, the other liberty running into license."[1] Concerning the publication of the "Institutes" Michelet remarks: "If the act was bold no less so was the style. The French language was then an unknown tongue; yet here, twenty years after Comines, thirty years before Montaigne, we have already the language of Rousseau, his power if not his charm. But the most formidable attribute of the volume is its penetrating clearness, its brilliance—of steel rather than of silver; a blade which shines but cuts. One sees that the light comes from within, from the depth of the conscience—from a spirit rigorously convinced, of which logic is the food. One feels that the author gives nothing to appearance—that he labors to find a solid argument upon which he can live and, if need be, die."

It was this wonderful book that led Farel to recognize its author as the one man who could save Geneva. Calvin had been on a visit to the pious duchess of Ferrara when he received his wonderful call. Following that call he built up a social order which had been entirely broken down. It was an immense work, and he was at every step compelled to contend with vigilant and unscrupulous enemies, but he proved himself equal to the occasion. He became chief pastor and preached earnestly against existing abuses, but for a time it seemed as if his efforts must remain fruitless. The wickedness of the

(1) Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," 7, p. 266.

people became so great that Calvin and his coadjutors refused to administer the Lord's Supper until there were signs of repentance. Persisting in their refusal, though threatened with death, they finally left the city, saying: "It is better to serve God than man."

Calvin found a refuge in Strasburg where for two years he ministered to a congregation of fifteen hundred French refugees. At this time he was married to Idelette de Bure, and for nine years she was his faithful helpmeet. They had a son who died in infancy, and a few years later the mother also went to rest. It is not true that her stern husband remained unimpressed by these afflictions. There is plenty of evidence to prove that his sorrow was sincere and profound; and to this one sweet memory he remained faithful to the end of life.

It is a wonderful fact that Geneva, after having driven Calvin away, in three years called him back. The affairs of the city had been going on from bad to worse, until absolute ruin was close at hand. In vain the council urged Calvin to return, but he declined until a number of Reformed cities urged him to hasten to the rescue. Then, in 1541, he returned to Geneva, with the full understanding that his plans of discipline were to be carried out.

From this time forth no king in Europe exercised so much power as did John Calvin. This power

was altogether moral; it was not that of a tyrant. He had no official position except that of a simple pastor. His annual salary was only 250 francs, with a plain house which is still standing in the Rue des Chanoines, and to this the council occasionally added a gift of cloth for a new coat. Like all the reformers he cared nothing for money; he had higher purposes than to accumulate wealth, and at the time of his death his whole estate amounted to less than two hundred dollars in our present money. And yet this poor, unpretentious man for nearly thirty years controlled the most important currents in the religious if not in the political life of Europe. Though he was in bad health, and, it was said "looked like a ghost," he sometimes for long periods preached every day, taught theology, wrote books, and was actively engaged in directing the affairs of church and state. Cranmer sought his advice with reference to the organization of the church of England. In Holland his letters made men strong to battle for their rights. Far away, in Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary his person was revered and his instruction accepted. In Scotland his influence was paramount; for, as a recent biographer says, "John Knox was another Calvin." In France the foremost of the nobility recognized him as their leader and instructor. Perhaps it was in Geneva itself that his authority was most frequently resisted; but

even there his silent power produced a social order that was the wonder of his age. That his stern discipline could hardly have been carried out in a larger state is readily conceded, but it became a model to all the nations of western Europe.

The close union of church and state sometimes led to inexcusable acts of tyranny and persecution. The most flagrant of these was the condemnation and execution of Michael Servetus for heresy. That the crime was regarded with universal detestation does not justify the cruelty of the punishment. Servetus was a Spanish physician, a man of considerable learning in his proper profession, but in theology a mere empiric. He appears not to have sought to reform the church but to destroy it. He had written a blasphemous book against the Trinity, and had been tried and condemned to death by the Roman Catholic authorities of Vienne. Escaping from prison he went to Geneva for the purpose, it is believed, of leading the party known as the Libertines in their opposition to the existing order. He was arrested and after a long trial was condemned to death. In his zeal for orthodoxy Calvin bore witness against him, and firmly believed that his condemnation was just; but he expressed a desire that the punishment should be mitigated. The council sought the advice of the leading Swiss churches which were unanimous in declaring that the extreme penalty of the law must

be enforced. The people were greatly excited, not only in Geneva, but throughout Europe, and nothing would satisfy them but the infliction of the severest punishment. Servetus was accordingly burned at the stake on the 27th of October, 1553.

Concerning this painful subject the American Encyclopædia very properly says: "The execution was in accordance with the laws of all the European states at that period. It was the inherited spirit of the times, and not the power of Calvin, that burned Servetus. The penalty was cruel; it is indefensible; it was even at that time impolitic. Neither civil nor religious liberty was at that time understood; still less was there any sharp distinction made between them. That analysis was the fruit of time, and of the seed which Calvin was at that time sowing in Geneva."

Calvin is frequently described as a cold, stern man who had little room in his nature for those tender affections which are the solace of life. No doubt he was a fierce controversialist, but if he was so cold and unresponsive, why was it that some of the noblest spirits of the age loved him with more than filial affection? Theodore Beza was a brilliant poet. He had been a curled and pampered darling of society—he came to Geneva arrayed in fine linen and reeking with unguents—yet it needed but an interview with Calvin to bring him to his knees. From that moment he became the associate and

assistant of that stern preacher of righteousness—his most intimate friend; his biographer and successor. Nor was Beza alone in such intimate affection. What was it that induced Clement Marot, the court-poet, to leave the service of royalty to translate psalms at Calvin's direction? What potent influence caused Melancthon to say that "he wished he could lay his weary head on Calvin's faithful heart and die there?" How was it that the light hearted duchess, Reneé of Ferrara, and the more quiet but not less worldly Margaret of Angouleme, turned from a career of fashionable dissipation to listen humbly to that solemn man? Why was it that the great nobles of France—Bourbon, Chattilon, Rohan, Soubise, Montmorency—learned to regard Calvin with all the affection of sons?

It is said that "Calvin never slept," and it is no doubt true, as Beza says, that "many a night he did not sleep, and many a day he had no time to look up to the blessed sun." Utterly worn out he died in his 54th year, on the 27th of May, 1564. He was buried in the public cemetery, and in accordance with his dying request no monument was erected over his grave.

Calvin's life was that of a theologian and scholar; it contained but few of the romantic elements on which biographers delight to dwell. He left no descendants to preserve the memorials of his great-

ness; no church to bear his name; and yet it is not too much to say that the most potent influences in modern history may be traced to his grand personality. More completely than in the case of any other Reformer has the biography of the leader become obscure as the sphere of his influence extended.

To relate the history of "the church under the cross" would require many volumes. As Calvin was, however, in a pre-eminent degree the leader of the Reformation in France, though he was personally a resident of Geneva, a brief sketch of the fortunes of French "Calvinism" may not be inappropriate.

As we have already seen there were, as early as 1524, little companies of Protestants here and there in France, who met in secret to read the word of God. At a later date these "societies" stood in the most intimate relations with the church of Geneva; and many of their members undertook long and dangerous journeys to the Swiss cities to receive the Holy Communion. There was, however, no regular church organization until 1555 when a nobleman, named La Ferriére, declared in a secret meeting that he would under no circumstances suffer his child to be baptized in accordance with the ceremonies of the Roman rite, at the same time demanding the election of a pastor. After fasting and prayer a young theologian, named La

Riviére, who had just arrived from Geneva, was chosen to this office, and at the same time a consistory of elders and deacons was elected and ordained. The Protestants of other French cities followed the example of the church in Paris, and four years later it became possible to hold a General Synod which adopted a confession of faith. "This," says Goebel, "is properly the beginning of the Reformed Church of France."

In the organization of these churches the model of Geneva was carefully observed. There was, of course, no dependence on the secular government, and the French congregations were, therefore, practically more independent than those of Switzerland; but otherwise the difference was hardly appreciable. Pastors were chosen by the consistory, but the congregation retained the right of veto. As the ruling elders were not chosen for a term of years, but for life or good behavior, there was a natural inclination to select representative men; and in the subsequent years of trial the elders became, in many instances, the secular leaders and defenders of the congregation.

The spread of the French Reformation was not limited by territorial boundaries. The Southern Netherlands were by vicinity of situation and a common language closely related to France; and there Calvinism progressed with great rapidity and assimilated various earlier forms of Protestant faith.

In 1559 Guido de Brés, pastor of "the church of the Rose-tree at Ryssel," composed the Belgic Confession; and in 1566 that confession was adopted by a synod at Antwerp. The Walloon and Netherland churches were most intimately related to those of France, and they mutually sustained and comforted each other while they remained under the cross.

It was from the beginning the misfortune of French Protestantism to be involved in politics. The old nobility were mainly on the Protestant side, and the king sought to humble them by attacking their religion. In their fortified castles the nobles for a time defied the royal power; but with the assistance of the church of Rome the king grew stronger, and the power of the nobility was proportionately decreased. The great majority of the people took the side of the king; and where Huguenots of humble station could not be protected by the nobles they became the object of bitter and unrelenting persecution.

In sketching the story of the Huguenots we must confine ourselves to the commonplaces of history. After the death of Francis I., it will be remembered, his son, Henry II., ascended the throne; but during his reign Diana of Poitiers was the actual ruler of France. His legitimate queen, Catharine de Medici, was content to remain in the background, subtle Italian as she was. After the

death of the king the throne was held for a few years by each of his three sons—Francis II., Charles IX., and Henry III.—but during all this period their mother, Catharine de Medici, held supreme power. Unless she is greatly calumniated she was one of the most wicked women that ever lived; and it is believed by some historians that two, at least, of her royal sons were murdered at her instigation, because they sought to free themselves from her control.

It was not easy for Catharine to hold her position; for it seemed probable that the royal house of Valois would soon become extinct, and the great families of the realm were already contending for the succession. Let a few of these pass across the stage in the persons of their leading representatives.

Next to the royal house stood the princes of the House of Bourbon, descended from Robert of Clermont, sixth son of Louis IX. (St. Louis) who in A.D. 1272 had married Beatrix, the heiress of the barony of Bourbon. The head of the house at this time was Antoine de Bourbon, who by his marriage with Jeanne d'Albret had become king of Navarre. He had become a Protestant, but was so weak and vacillating that he injured the religion which he professed to defend. More earnest and sincere was his younger brother, Louis, Prince of Condé—a typical child of the South; though gay, gallant, and fond of pleasure, he was chivalrously honorable and de-

votedly attached to the cause which he had espoused. When days of trouble came he fought with heroic valor; when his enemies offered bribes he simply laughed at them. At last his enemies became too strong for him, and after the battle of Jarnac, in which he was taken prisoner, he was treacherously assassinated.

Grandest of all the house of Bourbon was Jeanne d'Albret, queen of Navarre, the heroine of Rochelle, the mother of Henry IV. She it was who when her son was still in his minority assumed command of the Huguenot forces and led them to victory. When Catharine told her that to gain the kingdom of France for her son it was her duty to be reconciled with Rome, she exclaimed with passionate vehemence: "Madame, if at this moment I held my son and all the kingdoms of the world together, I would hurl them to the bottom of the sea, rather than imperil the salvation of my soul."

The Guise family assumed to be the political leaders of the Roman Catholics of France. Their father, Claude, first duke of Guise, was the fifth son of René, duke of Lorraine. He had entered France during the reign of Francis I., and had performed prodigies of valor as a French general. One of his daughters was the mother of Mary, Queen of Scots. "Six stalwart sons grew up around him, sharers of his fanaticism, his ambition, his talents and his success. Two of them became

dukes, two rose to be cardinals, one is known to history as the Marquis d'Elboeuf and the other as the grand prior."

United by a common purpose the Guise family appeared to be irresistible. All of them were men of ability but merciless as death. Regarding themselves as heirs of the ancient line of Charlemagne they proposed to lay claim to the throne of France on the extinction of the house of Valois, and in this purpose they were at one time encouraged by Catharine de Medici. Fanatically attached to the church of Rome, it was their avowed purpose to crush the Bourbons and with them to extirpate Protestantism in France.

It is hardly probable that the Bourbons could have maintained themselves against the Guises, if they had not been sustained by the great majority of the nobles, most prominent among whom were the Chatillons who were represented by three brothers, nephews of the old Connétable de Montmorency. Most prominent of the three was Gaspard, who from his estate in Franche Comté was known as Coligni, Governor of Picardy and afterwards grand admiral of France. His influence in the south was hardly less than that of the Guises in the north. While in captivity after the siege of St. Quentin he had read the Bible and the works of Calvin ; and when he was thereby led to a change of faith no one doubted the genuineness of his con-

version. Surely Michelet is right when de declares that Coligni was the greatest convert that John Calvin ever made.

In their extreme fanaticism the Guises began to exterminate the Protestants with fire and sword, and the latter were forced to engage in a war of self-defense. At the conjuration of Amboise, in 1560, the political and religious elements of the Huguenot cause were welded together. Calvin did not approve of the alliance, and warned his friends that "those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword." Summoned to appear before the king Beza said: "Sire, it is true that it is the lot of the church of God, in whose name I speak to endure blows and not to strike them; but may it also please you to remember that it is an anvil that has worn out many hammers."

We shall not tell the story of the wars which for the next decade devastated France. There came at last a season when it seemed as if the main objects of the Huguenots had been accomplished. Coligni and his coadjutors had been everywhere victorious. By the treaty of St. Germain the Huguenots were granted four towns—among them La Rochelle—which they were to hold and garrison as a pledge of good faith. To cement the treaty Catharine de Medici arranged that her beautiful but worthless daughter, Marguerite of Valois, should be given in marriage to Henry, the young king of Navarre, and

all the great nobles were invited to come to Paris to share in the festivities.

It is hardly necessary to speak at length of the ill-fated alliance which is known as the Bloody Wedding. The massacre of St. Bartholomew which immediately succeeded it was declared by Queen Elizabeth of England to have been "the most atrocious act committed by men since the crucifixion of Christ." The chief actor in the tragedy was, of course, Catharine de Medici, the evil genius of that evil age. Most recent historians say that she was implicated with the duke of Guise in a plot to assassinate Coligni, who had advised the king to emancipate himself from his mother's control. The murder was attempted but failed; the admiral was wounded but not killed. The excitement was intense, and it became evident that the instigators of the crime would be discovered. In their desperation the chief conspirators persuaded the king that he was himself to be the victim of a great Huguenot conspiracy, and that vigorous measures must be taken to ward off the threatening danger. At first the king refused to listen to these accusations; but at last he petulantly exclaimed: "Well, if it must be so, kill them all! Let no one be left to reproach me with this deed." This was enough for the queen-mother. Orders were secretly given to the soldiers and to the leaders of the papal party. At midnight, on the 24th of August, 1572,

the great bell of St. Germain l' Auxerrois rang the alarm ; the king's soldiers began the massacre by murdering the Huguenot leaders in their lodgings, and it was easy to give a hint of what was going on to the gathering crowd that was only too ready to assist in slaying the helpless Protestants. Any one who knows the *canaille* of Paris need not be surprised at the result. That fearful monster, loosed from its chains, had tasted blood, and, as on many more recent occasions, it seemed as if its fearful lust could never be glutted. Other cities followed the example of Paris, and thirty thousand —some say a hundred thousand—of the best men and women in France were ruthlessly sacrificed. In many places, however, the royal mandate was not obeyed. At Lisieux, for instance, the Roman Catholic bishop gathered the Huguenots into his palace and protected them from the fury of the mob. Rochelle and Sancerre closed their gates, and it soon became evident that as a means of destroying the Huguenots the massacre had proved a failure. On its first anniversary the Reformed churches of France held a synod at Montauban, at which a formal demand was made upon the court to punish the murderers and to reverse the attainder against Coligni. No wonder that Catharine exclaimed : "If Condé were living, and were here with fifty thousand men, his demands would not be half so bold." The Huguenots had, however, suf-

fered greatly by the loss of their most eminent men. Among these was Pierre Ramée, the most learned man of his time, and Claude Goudimel, the celebrated musical composer. And Coligni, the great, was dead also. History has proved his best avenger. Three hundred years after his death the city of Paris erected his statue at the place of his assassination. The Medicis, the Guises, have disappeared from history; the Bourbons are exiles from their native soil; but the direct deecendant of Coligni—the representative of his house and the defender of his faith—is seated on the imperial throne of Germany.[1]

Let us hasten to escape from the dreadful scenes of St. Bartholomew! For two years Henry of Navarre was kept a prisoner; then he escaped and put himself at the head of the Huguenots. After strange vicissitudes he gained his crowning victory at Ivry, in 1590. In the mean time events had happened which aided him in his political purposes. The duke of Guise and the cardinal of Lorraine had been slain by the orders of the king, Henry III., who was in turn assassinated by a fanatical priest. All serious obstacles to the triumph of Henry of Navarre appeared to be removed, and we can well appreciate the emotions of the Huguenot

(1) The celebrated Louisa Henrietta of Brandenburg, mother of the first king of Prussia, was a granddaughter of Coligni.

soldier, so splendidly expressed in Macaulay's well-known ballad on "The Battle of Ivry."

The moment of triumph was, however, the beginning of Huguenot decline. Henry of Navarre, who had proved that he possessed the heroism of his mother, now exhibited the weakness of his father. Like the image which the king of Babylon beheld in his dream his head was of fine gold, but his feet were partly of iron and partly of clay. He renounced Protestantism, after successfully fighting its battles, on the ground that his act would bring peace to his distracted country. Paris, it was said, would never accept a Huguenot king, and Henry himself is said to have flippantly declared that Paris was "worth a mass." It is, however, by no means certain that he could not have attained his political ends without violence to his conscience. His great rivals had passed away, and after another victory the capital would probably have received him, Huguenot as he was. Paris always kisses the hand that smites her, if only it smites hard enough.

It is certain that by this act of apostasy Henry IV. alienated the affections of the best part of his people. He lost the confidence of the Protestants without thereby securing the faithful allegiance of the Catholics, and finally fell by the dagger of a fanatic of the faith which he had assumed.

During his reign Henry IV. did all in his power to relieve the unfortunate political and social condition of his former associates. The Edict of Nantes, which he issued in 1598, secured them toleration for nearly a century; but it was bare toleration, and it was under his immediate successor that Richelieu introduced the policy of repression which in 1685 culminated in the revocation of the edict. Louis XIV. appears to have imagined that the Huguenots would yield at once to his royal will; and when they refused to sacrifice their faith and conscience his persecuting rage knew no bounds. In the region of the Cevennes the persecuted people rose in self-defense, and for ten years kept up an unequal contest in which they performed prodigies of valor. The sufferings of the Cevennois were, however, terrific. Four hundred towns and villages were reduced to ashes and the country for twenty leagues was left a desert.

Though the Protestants were forbidden to leave France multitudes succeeded in making their escape. Wherever they went they bore with them artistic culture and the love of liberty.

Protestantism in France survived the dragonades, though it was not until the time of the Revolution that it emerged entirely from the shadow of the cross. In other countries the exiled Huguenots achieved the honor that was denied them in their fatherland. They laid the foundations of the great-

ness of Prussia; they rendered prosperous the manufactures of England. In America they proved excellent pioneers, and their descendants have been among our foremost citizens. With Mrs. Sigourney, who has been termed their American laureate, we may pray:

> "On all who bear
> Their name or lineage may their mantle rest—
> That firmness for the truth, that calm content
> With simple pleasures, that unswerving trust
> In toil, adversity, and death, which cast
> Such healthful leaven 'mid the elements
> That peopled the new world."

THOMAS CRANMER

V.

THE STRUGGLE OF THE CREEDS.

CRANMER AND KNOX.

DURNG the early stages of the Reformation it seemed as if England would remain unmoved. There had, indeed, been an attempt at reformation under Wycliffe, but it had been violently suppressed, and Lollards could be found only in obscure places. A little company of scholars, led by John Colet and Sir Thomas More—who flourished at the beginning of the sixteenth century—have sometimes been called "the Oxford Reformers;" but they were Humanists—disciples of Erasmus—who protested against the monastic system and the ignorance which it engendered, but were well satisfied to live and die in the communion of the church of Rome. England was slowly recovering from the devastations of the Wars of the Roses; the people desired above all things peace and quietness, and were subservient to their rulers to a degree that had been hitherto unknown.

It was necessary, therefore, that in England the way for the Reformation should be prepared by a series of events that were purely political. In other countries the Reformation had been, first and foremost, a religious movement; its most prominent directors were the men of light and learning, the great theologians, the distinguished orators, the

men of genius of their age, who directed the thought and the emotions of the people. Political elements were subordinated to those which were purely religious ; and even in France the secular struggle was due to an unholy alliance which resulted in the humiliation of the church. In England, on the other hand, the positions of the religious and political elements were reversed. The Reformation was preceded by a great political movement—a bold stroke for national autonomy—which in the Providence of God opened the way for spiritual deliverance. It was the all-pervading influence of royalty—the repressive power of secular authority—that for a time forced the religious leaders into the background, and compelled them to labor in comparative obscurity.

Henry VIII., who ascended the English throne in 1509, was for some time the most popular prince in Europe. His father, Henry VII.—popularly known as Harry Tudor—though the recognized representative of the house of Lancaster, had been in fact a soldier of fortune whose claim to the throne was based on conquest. To strengthen his defective title he had not only secured recognition by the pope, but had married Elizabeth, the heiress of the house of York. It was not, however, until the next generation that the nation felt confident that the claims of the rival houses were settled, and Henry VIII. was the personal pledge of peace.

Henry VII. had been a shrewd man. Narrow-minded and venial—avaricious and merciless—he yet manifested extraordinary skill in the establishment of his dynasty. Having two sons, the eldest, Arthur, was of course expected to become his successor on the throne; but what to do with the younger son, Henry, was a difficult question. Younger sons have always been the terrors of dynasties; and in this case the elder brother was in mental and physical strength greatly excelled by the younger. It was not likely that Henry would be permanently satisfied with a subordinate position, and who could tell whether the conflicts of the brothers might not result in a new War of the Roses? Under these circumstances the king conceived the idea of educating Henry for the church. In this way he hoped to remove him from the sphere of active politics—for who had ever heard of a priest who became a pretender to a throne? And if the king should finally succeed in elevating him to the position of archbishop of Canterbury, might he not hope to rule the church of England in the person of his son? Henry was accordingly sent to school and became an excellent scholar—manifesting special aptitude for theological study; and there is no reason to doubt that he was in later days the real author of the works which bear his name.

Having thus, as he supposed, provided for his second son, the king proceeded to negotiate a marriage for Arthur. Money was the first consideration, and he accordingly made application for the hand of one of the daughters of Ferdinand of Spain, who was the richest monarch in Europe. The covetous heart of the king of England rejoiced when the negotiations proved successful and the first remittance of Spanish doubloons was poured into his treasury. In those days young folks had little to say in such matters, and Catherine vainly protested when she was sent to what she regarded as a land of barbarians. On the 14th of November, 1501, she was married to Prince Arthur, who was but fifteen years old. Less than four months after the marriage her husband died of consumption and Catherine was left a widow.

The state of affairs was now materially changed. In June, 1502, Henry assumed the title of Prince of Wales, and was declared heir to the kingdom. But what was to be done with the dowager princess Catherine of Arragon, who was now decidedly *de trop?* The king of Spain insisted that his daughter's dowry must be returned, and that she must annually receive a share of the revenues of the principality of Wales. As Ferdinand was strong enough to enforce his claim, the king of England at first saw no way out of the difficulty, except to refund the dowry ; and if there was anything which

he detested it was to pay debts. At last he conceived the bold expedient of marrying the princess to his younger son. It was in direct opposition to the canonical law for a man to marry his deceased brother's wife; but it was insisted that Arthur's marriage had been merely formal, and the pope was persuaded to grant a dispensation. Prince Henry formally protested; but the miserable affair was carried on to its appointed conclusion.

For twenty years Henry and Catherine lived together without scandal, but they had little in common. Henry was ambitious and tyrannical; Catherine haughty, if not melancholy, and extremely devout after the Spanish fashion. They had several children, but they died in infancy, except one sickly princess, Mary. There can be little doubt that the king convinced himself that his marriage was incestuous, on the ground that the pope had transcended his authority in granting a dispensation for marriage with a deceased brother's wife. After he met Anne Boleyn, the daughter of the earl of Wiltshire, his convictions on this subject were decidedly strengthened, and soon afterward began the proceedings for a divorce from Catherine which constitute one of the most unpleasant pages in English history. Popes were in those days inclined to be subservient to crowned heads; and if Catherine had been a princess of inferior degree it may perhaps be taken for granted

that Clement would have acceded to Henry's wishes without delay; but she was an infanta of Spain, and the aunt of the emperor, Charles V., who breathed threatenings and slaughter if the decree of divorce should be granted. No wonder that Macaulay pities the pope who stood between the fiend and the flood. After all, Spain and Germany were more powerful than England, and the papal decree was withheld. Henry, however, was not a man whose purposes could be crossed with impunity. Cardinal Wolsey, his prime minister, lived in royal state while he aided his master in his efforts to secure the divorce, but when he ventured to remonstrate he fell. Thomas Cromwell was advanced to high station for advising the king to declare himself supreme head of the Church of England; and it was mainly through his influence that the monastic system was abrogated; but at last he too became a victim of the tyrant's wrath.

Henry VIII. had no love for Protestantism. To the end of his life his views on most doctrinal questions were the same as when he wrote his book against Luther. It was his purpose to preserve the ancient system in its minutest particulars, with the single exception that in the church, no less than in the state, he recognized no higher authority than his own. By the act of supremacy he was recognized as the head of the Church of England, and interference with his prerogative was construed as

treason. The king was practically the pope of England, and there was no room for any other papal authority. He therefore persecuted Protestants and Romanists alike, and though his conflict with the pope no doubt facilitated the introduction of Protestantism, it is not just to call him the founder of the Protestant Church of England.

It was not until after the fall of Cromwell, in 1540, that Thomas Cranmer became the most influential subject in the realm, though he had held for seven years the highest ecclesiastical office. Concerning Cranmer's early life little is known. He was born of respectable parentage at Aslacton, in Nottinghamshire, July 2, 1489; and was educated at Cambridge, where he became a lecturer in theology. Until he was forty years old no one supposed that he would ever be anything but one of the magnates of the university. The circumstances which led to his exaltation were in their way sufficiently romantic. In the summer of 1529 the plague known as "the sweating sickness" broke out in Cambridge, and Cranmer accompanied two of his pupils, named Cressy, to their father's house at Waltham Abbey, in Essex. At this time the king's suit for a divorce had begun before Cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio in England, but the court had been prorogued, and it was generally believed that in consequence of the queen's appeal the cause would be removed to Rome. In great perplexity

the king, with the two cardinals, retired to Waltham, and it so happened that two of his chief counsellors, Fox and Gardiner, lodged at Mr. Cressy's house while Cranmer was there. The three guests were old college friends and naturally discussed the chief topic of the day; and Cranmer remarked that if the universities and lawyers should decide that marriage with a deceased brother's widow was illegal, notwithstanding the pope's dispensation, the divorce might be granted by the ordinary ecclesiastical courts, without appealing to Rome. When this opinion was reported to the king he is said to have exclaimed: "I will see this man. Let him be sent for out of hand. The man, I trow, has the right sow by the ear."

At his first interview with the king Cranmer was ordered to lay aside all other business and to devote himself entirely to the matter of the divorce. From this time his advancement was rapid. He was successively sent on missions to the pope and emperor, but accomplished little. On his way, however, he met several of the Protestant princes; and at Nuremberg was married to a niece of the celebrated theologian Osiander. There can be no doubt that even at this time his sentiments were decidedly favorable to the Protestants, but he had to sing low in the king's presence. It was while he was in Germany that he was nominated archbishop of Canterbury, and it became necessary to

keep his marriage a profound secret. Indeed, for a long time the archbishop's family remained in obscurity; and there is a somewhat doubtful story that when traveling he conveyed his wife in a chest, which on one occasion a stupid porter upset and thus led to the discovery of the inmate, who called lustily for help.

That Cranmer did not desire the office of archbishop may well be believed. It involved great responsibilities; and a braver man might well have hesitated before he assumed them. The will of the king, was, however, practically irresistible; and Cranmer yielded without loud murmurings. He may, indeed, have regarded it preferable to run the risk of losing his head as archbishop than to lose it for refusing to accept the office. It was known at Rome that Cranmer was favorable to the divorce, but the pope yielded to the king's importunity and the consecration was speedily authorized. The peculiar position of the new archbishop is indicated by the fact that before his consecration he made a protest that the oath of obedience to the pope was to be taken by him merely as a matter of form, and that it should not bind him to anything against the king, or prevent him from reforming anything that he found amiss in the church of England. He also took an oath to the king renouncing all grants from the pope that might be prejudicial to his highness.

Cranmer appears to have regarded himself as simply an instrument of the king's will. To him the doctrine of royal supremacy was fundamental. No fanatical Romanist ever regarded the papacy with greater reverence than that which he felt for royalty. The king was to him the visible representative of the divine presence, and there was no room for divided allegiance on the part of his subjects. That the king could do wrong was hardly conceivable; but at all events it was he who was responsible for the faith and conduct of his people, and the individual who presumed to oppose his private opinions to the royal decree was guilty of heresy and treason. It was in fact the theory which was subsequently systematically presented by Hobbes in his "Leviathan," and which led to the long conflicts between the king and parliament, finally resulting in the fall of the royal house of Stuart.

That Cranmer was not of the stuff of which heroes are made will be readily acknowledged; but a hero would in those days have been strangely out of place in the position which he occupied. Historians have treated him with scant courtesy, and there can be no doubt that he had to take great leaps and turn sharp corners to keep up with his royal master; but we think they have generally failed to recognize the extent to which unquestioning obedience to the king had become with him a

matter of conscience. Personally timid, he was strong only when supported by a royal mandate. Naturally kind and gentle, he sometimes ventured to plead for the victims of the king's wrath; he even begged the king to have mercy on Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More, who were not his friends; but he always spoiled his petitions by concluding them with a recognition of the transcendent wisdom of the monarch, and an expression of his willingness to submit to his enlightened will. At the king's direction the matter of the divorce was soon after his consecration removed to the archepiscopal court, and from this time forward everything was done in accordance with the king's desire. Queen Catherine declined to appear and was declared contumacious; and the archbishop gave judgment declaring the marriage null and void from the first. "In the whole proceeding," says the Encyclopædia Brittanica, "the archbishop's subserviency was pitiful, and it is difficult to acquit him of the graver charge of knowingly pronouncing an unrighteous sentence."

It was the policy of the king to pay ostensibly the greatest deference to the church while compelling the church to yield absolute obedience to his caprices. As official head of the church of England Cranmer was made to appear as the king's chief adviser, while in fact he was constantly occupied in finding excuses for his master's conduct.

It was less dangerous to attack the archbishop than to criticize the king, and the former was naturally made the chief targets of the opponents of the royal policy. If he had ventured to interfere with the accomplishment of the king's purposes his life would, of course, have been forfeited; and it is marvellous that during all these trying years he was able to retain his master's confidence.

There is evidence that in his official acts Cranmer was constantly constrained by royal authority. When, in 1535, queen Ann Boleyn was arrested and sent to the tower, her old chaplain the archbishop was ordered to come up from the country to Lambeth to hold himself in readiness till further intimation was made of the king's pleasure. He was in fact virtually a prisoner until it became evident that he would officially annul the monarch's second marriage.

To follow the public career of Cranmer in all its particulars is beyond our purpose. We recognize his weakness and have no desire to become his apologist. In his purely ecclesiastical relations he appears, however, in a light which is altogether more favorable. It is evident that he thoroughly appreciated the evils that oppressed Christendom and labored earnestly for their removal. His theology, it is true, was not so decidedly Protestant as it afterwards became, but he steadily pursued the policy which has associated his name with the

development of the Reformation in England. He promoted the circulation of the Bible in the vernacular, and procured an order, in 1538, that a copy of the Scriptures should be placed in every church in a convenient place for reading. He also began his labors in the revision of the ritual of the church, and translated the German Catechism of Justus Jonas, known as Cranmer's Catechism, which, however, was not published until after the death of King Henry.

At last, on the 28th of January, 1547, the tyrant of England died. Cranmer was with him in his last illness, and after his death read masses for the repose of his soul. From our present standpoint it is difficult to form a proper conception of Henry VIII. "In some of his acts," says Sir James Mackintosh, "he approaches as nearly to the standard of perfect wickedness as the infirmities of human nature will allow." Yet on the other hand it must be acknowledged that he was the most learned prince of his age; and that he possessed a certain personal magnetism which attracted men of all classes to his service and secured their unquestioning obedience. During his reign England grew stronger, and his opposition to Rome gave room for the development of the new life which revealed itself in the reigns of his successors. When he died the way was open for the establishment of the Protestant church of England.

On the death of Henry VIII. the succession devolved on his son Edward VI. who was but ten years of age. Cranmer was named in the royal testament as one of the council to govern the realm during the young king's minority ; but it does not appear that he exerted much influence in secular matters. The government was actually in the hands of the duke of Somerset, and, as in the former reign, Cranmer was content to follow when he might have led. At the coronation of the young king he took out a new commission to discharge his archepiscopal functions, acknowledging in a public address that all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical and secular alike, emanated from the sovereign.

In the mean time the Reformation was developing in a way that must have filled Cranmer with anxiety. He saw that the time for a great change had come, and he himself recognized its necessity. In doctrine he agreed in a general way with the reformers of the Continent ; but as regards organization and discipline he was unwilling to depart from the ancient precedents of the realm. He was fond of the splendor of ancient ceremonials, and was determined at all hazards to maintain the closest connection between the church and civil government. Cranmer is often called the first Protestant archbishop of England, but if this term is admitted it must be with many qualifications. Protestantism, as we understand it, was in Germany

just assuming a settled form; while in England there was everywhere confusion and conflict. The reforming and the conservative or Romanising parties had barely tolerated each other during the preceding reign; now it was hardly possible to keep them within the same organization. Both parties had abjured the pope's jurisdiction and had admitted the king's supremacy; but now that the heavy hand of King Henry had been removed they pulled in different directions. There was great danger that Protestantism would assume the extravagant character which had characterized the Anabaptist movement in Germany; and it was due in great measure to the efforts of Archbishop Cranmer that the reformation in England received the conservative form by which it has ever since been distinguished.

King Edward VI. was a precocious boy who fully comprehended the great questions at issue in the controversies of his times. He had been trained by his father's sixth wife, Catharine Parr, a woman of great learning who was a decided Protestant. Though a child in years he corresponded with the theologians of the continent, and personally took an important part in the construction of the liturgy of the church of England.

The first important act of Reformation on the part of the new government concerned the abolishment of ancient ceremonies, such as the carrying of

candles on Candlemas, and the use of ashes on Ash Wednesday. The removal of images from the churches, which had been previously ordered, was also insisted on, much to the wrath of Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, the ablest man of the old conservative party; but Ridley and old Hugh Latimer preached against these "helps to devotion" with so much fire and enthusiasm that even the royal authority would hardly have sufficed to keep them there.

The church of England, as it appeared in the reign of Edward VI., was undoubtedly to some extent of the nature of a compromise. The leaders were generally desirous of assimilating the church to the Reformed churches of the Continent, and every doctrinal expression was decidedly Protestant; a large party, on the other hand, insisted that the peculiarities of the ancient church must be scrupulously preserved. The episcopal office held so prominent a place in the civil order that the government desired that it should be retained. Calvin and Bullinger were consulted on the subject, and neither objected to the episcopal form of government, but advised that the religious services should be "clean and without pomp." When Hooper was, in 1550, appointed bishop of Gloucester he objected to wearing the robes; but Bullinger advised him to accommodate himself in such minor matters to the policy of the government. John Knox, of Scot-

land, was offered an English bishopric, but he was of sterner mould than those who accepted these so-called *adiaphora* and declined the office.

Cranmer's relations to the Continental reformers gradually became intimate. At first he was strongly attracted by the writings of Luther, but all attempts to negotiate terms of union with the German Protestants proved unsuccessful in consequence of the prejudice of the king and many of the bishops. At a later period Cranmer entered into an intimate correspondence with the Swiss divines, and in the sacramental controversy the church of England was recognized as standing on the Reformed side. In 1536, just after the king's marriage to Jane Seymour, Cranmer had been introduced by Prof. Simon Grynaeus, of Strasburg, to Henry Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli as antistes, or chief-pastor of the church of Zurich. In the same year Cranmer sent to Zurich three young Englishmen, John Butler, William Woodruff, and Nicholas Partridge, for the purpose of studying theology and becoming acquainted with the Swiss churches. They remained there more than a year and on their return to England were accompanied by Rudolph Gualter, who afterwards married Zwingli's daughter, Regula, and became the third antistes of the church of Zurich. In the succeeding reign the king sent Christopher Mont to Zurich with a letter to Bullinger in which he desired a closer union between

the churches of England and Switzerland; and in 1747, according to Pestalozzi, the Swiss churches were officially informed that the church of England had accepted the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Soon afterwards Cranmer invited a number of eminent Reformed theologians to settle in England to give advice to the king's council concerning the reformation of the church. Among these were Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, Fagius, Ochino, A'Lasco, and other distinguished men. Some of these men were actively engaged in the preparation of the Book of Common Prayer, and all of them exerted an important influence in the development of the Reformation in England. For this work Bucer was especially well prepared, having in 1541 assisted Herman V., archbishop of Cologne, who proposed to introduce the Reformation into his diocese without making greater changes in the government and ritual of the church than were absolutely necessary. The movement, however, had proved unsuccessful and the good archbishop was compelled to resign his office. In England Bucer's preliminary liturgical studies proved of great value. The English ritual was founded on the old missal of Sarum, but it was modified and improved according to the necessities of the times, and the result was an order of worship which for dignity and excellence of style has hardly an equal among the liturgies of the church.

The brief reign of Edward VI. appears to have been set aside by Providence as a proper time for the organization of the Protestant church of England. Compared with preceding and succeeding reigns it is a green oasis in the midst of the desert. Cranmer, supported by the royal will, accomplished wonders in behalf of the cause to which he was sincerely attached, and every see was soon occupied by its stout defenders. These men exerted an important influence in determining the external form of the church of England, but it was not from them, we feel assured, that it derived its profoundest life. In the best sense it was a popular movement, and from the beginning it produced numerous examples of piety and self-sacrificing devotion. As regards the organization of the church, whatever its enemies may have said, history has shown that Cranmer and his coadjutors well understood the requirements of their age and nation. With all its imperfections—due chiefly to its close connection with the state—the church of England has proved a mighty power for good—decorous and beautiful—and endeared to millions of loving children.

To the Protestant cause the death of the young king, in 1553, was a dreadful calamity. Foreseeing the event Edward had endeavored to change the succession to the throne in favor of his cousin, Lady Jane Grey. Here Cranmer committed a grievous error. Influenced partly by dread of the

reaction which was sure to come with the accession of Mary, and partly perhaps by the personal peculiarity which could refuse nothing to a crowned head, he contradicted his former action by which the order of succession had been established. English ideas of legitimacy were too strong to be overcome, and by approving the king's testament Cranmer sealed his fate. Mary, the daughter of Catherine of Arragon, had little difficulty in securing the throne, and Lady Jane, who against her will had been declared queen of England was, after a nominal reign of nine days, committed to the tower. There, after the failure of the second attempt in her favor, she died on the scaffold.

It can hardly be supposed that Queen Mary ever intended to spare Cranmer, whom she regarded as mainly instrumental in securing her father's divorce and thus affixing a stain to her own legitimacy. It is true, indeed, that when he was condemned for treason for having caused Lady Jane to be proclaimed, Queen Mary refused to authorize his execution; but he was kept in prison, and his office was declared forfeited. It is plain that his enemies proposed to inflict a punishment more terrible than an ordinary execution on political grounds.

Cranmer remained in prison, while his friends Ridley and Latimer were conveyed to their place of martyrdom, without having been granted an op-

portunity of defending themselves against their accusers. Their heroism in this trying hour has left its effect on all subsequent generations:

> "For thus said aged Latimer:
> I tarry by the stake,
> Not trusting in my own weak heart,
> But for the Saviour's sake.
> Why speak of life or death to me
> Whose days are but a span?
> Our crown is yonder —Ridley, see!
> Be strong and play the man!
> God helping, such a torch this day
> We'll light on English land,
> That Rome, with all her cardinals,
> Shall never quench the brand."

During his imprisonment the weaknesses of Cranmer's character became painfully apparent. His enemies almost seem to have played with him —summoning him to Rome when he was in prison, and then condemning him for contumaciousness; holding out delusive hopes of pardon, and thus inducing him to recant his former teachings. He signed no less than six documents in which he repudiated Protestantism, urging all heretics to return to the unity of the church. His enemies had planned a crowning act of triumph. It was determined that he must die, but before his final condemnation he was required to make a public confession; but at last he turned upon his enemies, retracted his former statements, and declared his firm adherence to the Protestant faith. At the same time he declared that inasmuch as his hand

had offended in writing contrary to the convictions of his heart; it should be the first to suffer; and when he was chained to the stake, and the fire began to burn near him, he thrust his right hand into the flame, exclaiming: "This hand hath offended."

The death of Cranmer was the signal for the flight of all decided Protestants who could find their way out of England. Zurich was crowded with English refugees, and the Swiss were sometimes put to great straits in entertaining them. After the refugees returned to England, Bishops Parkhurst, Jewell, and Horn sent gifts of silver plate in recognition of the kindness of the Swiss churches. There was a tendency to minimize differences; and even to this day continental writers generally recognize the church of England as one of the Reformed churches. "The Anglican, that is, the English church," says Stilling, "is different from the rest of the Reformed church only in this, that it has an episcopal form of government. Are the Swedish and Danish churches not Lutheran because they have bishops? Does the garment make the man?"

During the reign of Mary every effort was made to restore England to Roman obedience. Cardinal Pole became Cranmer's successor in the see of Canterbury; but Bishops Gardiner and Bonner were, we suppose, chiefly responsible for the so-called "Marian persecutions." The queen was not

naturally cruel, but she was unfortunate and unhappy. Her marriage to Philip II. of Spain was, on her part, apparently prompted by sincere affection; but he maltreated and deserted her. To win his favor she imitated his methods of dealing with religious dissenters; but she gained nothing but the reputation of a bloody persecutor. You may remember that on English money, coined in 1555, the faces of the royal pair are represented side by side and pretty close to each other, and that Butler, with keenest satire, says, in "Hudibras," that certain lovers look

> —"amorous, and fond, and billing,
> Like Philip and Mary on a shilling."

Mary, like Julian the apostate in the early history of the church, ventured to become the champion of a lost cause. It was too late; and at the end of her brief reign the church of Rome was weaker than at its beginning. In 1558 Mary was taken with an intermittent fever, and it soon became evident that it would prove fatal. When death approached the venial crowd of courtiers hastened to make their peace with the Princess Elizabeth, and Mary was left to die alone.

We pass rapidly over the reforms in the English church during the reign of Elizabeth. For some months after her accession the struggle of the creeds was intense, and it seemed doubtful which side the queen would take. She had, it is true,

been educated under Protestant influences, but during the reign of Mary she had kept her head on her shoulders by professing her sister's creed. She was the best educated woman in England, and undoubtedly sympathized with the spirit of progress which was best represented by the Protestant Reformation; but she also loved the splendor of the ancient church and desired to preserve its ritual. There are writers who believe that if the pope of Rome had promptly acknowledged Elizabeth as queen of England a schism might have been avoided; but this is hardly probable. Elizabeth was too much like her father to have been satisfied with any position inferior to that of supreme governor of the church of England.

The queen had carefully studied the religious questions of the age, and possessed the gift of expressing herself in aphoristic language, which created the impression of extraordinary wisdom and yet left her practically uncommitted to any distinctive view. Take, for instance, her celebrated utterance on the Lord's Supper:

> "Christ was the word that spake it;
> He took the bread and brake it;
> And what His word did make it,
> That I believe, and take it."

The age of Elizabeth can hardly be regarded as in the highest sense religious. It was a splendid epoch in literary history; the age, we remember,

of the great poets, Spenser, Jonson, and Shakspeare; of great thinkers like Bacon and Sir Thomas Browne; of elegant courtiers and men of letters, like Sir Philip Sidney and Sir Walter Raleigh—yes, even of great theologians like "the judicious Hooker;" but after all it had more of the spirit of the renaissance than of the Reformation. It was an age hostile to the papacy, but for a while this sentiment was hardly separable from hatred of Spain. It has been said that the Roman church in England "committed suicide." The phrase must be understood to mean that it took a course which inevitably led to its destruction. It certainly encouraged treason and welcomed the Armada. If it had not been for a few Roman Catholic noblemen who supported the queen in her conflict with Spain, Romanism would probably have been no longer tolerated in England.

The acceptance of the 39 articles had been a declaration of the fact that the church of England was decidedly Protestant; but the return of the Marian exiles was the signal for the beginning of a conflict within the church. These men brought with them an intense dislike for ceremonials and vestments, and possibly a stronger and more earnest faith than was general in England, where the church was regarded by many as "a branch of the civil service." The government endeavored to compel them to submit to the established order, but

as they refused to conform they became non-conformists. Thomas Cartwright, a professor of theology, was their most eminent man; but for some time they remained unorganized, and to such prelates as Parker and Jewell their protests did not seem to be of great importance. It was not until the next reign that this movement developed into Puritanism, which has sometimes been called "the second Reformation." To consider the history of the wonderful series of events which it includes would be a fascinating undertaking; but it does not lie within the field of our present study.

It is in the kingdom north of the Tweed that, at this period, we behold the greatest changes. These changes were, indeed, political as well as religious; but those of the former character were chiefly important as preparing the way for the latter.

Scotland has been so glorified by writers of romance, that those who derive their impressions from Sir Walter Scott, not to speak of Jane Porter and Grace Aguilar, are apt to suppose that it was before the Reformation a land of chivalry more splendid than Normandy or Provence. Minute examination would hardly confirm this impression. The fact is that the country was wild and uncultivated, and it was the last in western Europe to be touched by the glories of the renaissance. The people were divided into many clans, or tribes, which were frequently at war; and amid the strug-

gles of the chiefs royalty had a precarious existence. Nearly all the kings of the house of Stuart died a violent death, and with each death there came a struggle for the succession. In their efforts to control the turbulent nobles the kings naturally followed the example of their ancient allies, the kings of France—making the Roman hierarchy the chief instrument for the accomplishment of their political purposes. They impoverished themselves to enrich the church; and the magnificence of the ruins scattered all over northern Britain still testifies to the splendor of the dwellings of its priests. In this way the interests of royalty and hierarchy stood and fell together. The plan had been well laid; but like many other plans "it went aglee." In France the nobles had been originally a conquering race—Frank not Celtic—and the people had hated them for a thousand years. The alliance of king and priests was, therefore, in that country, certain of popular support, and the result could not be doubtful. In Scotland, on the other hand, the relations of the clans and their chiefs were intimate and affectionate. The humblest member of the clan regarded himself as of the same blood as his chief, and was ready to follow his pibroch to battle and death. In brief, it was in Scotland that the feudal system had in this respect attained its highest development; and neither royalty nor hierarchy was strong enough to break its spirit.

That the church of Scotland was before the Reformation in a depressed condition will hardly be denied. Greek was not taught anywhere in Scotland, and the Scriptures were practically unknown. At one of the early religious controversies, it is said, the monks refused to listen to citations from the New Testament. "We do not want anything new," they exclaimed, "the Old Testament is good enough for us as it has been for our fathers."

The news of the German Reformation had reached Scotland at an early day. In those days Scotchmen travelled all over Europe as dealers in small wares, so that in Germany every peddler was called a Scot. These men brought home the news of evangelical liberty, and the message found a warm response in the hearts of those country-people who still preserved the traditions of the Culdees—the ancient Christians who had been the teachers of Scotland before the supremacy of Rome. As early as 1525 the Scotch parliament issued a proclamation against the Lutheran heresy—forbidding the people to speak about it, and permitting the priests to mention its name only when they proposed to refute it. Persecutions soon began, and Patrick Hamilton, a relative of the royal house, was burned at the stake. The blood of the martyrs proved the seed of the church, and with every martyrdom the power of the hierarchy decreased. The grandest, the noblest, of the early martyrs was

JOHN KNOX

George Wishart, who was executed in 1546. When he was on his way to his death, it is said, he laid his hand on the head of a young man who desired to accompany him, and solemnly—almost prophetically—committed to his care the highest interests of the church in Scotland.

John Knox, who accepted this solemn trust, is one of the most picturesque figures in the history of the Reformation. He was born in 1505, in Haddington, not far from Edinburgh. Tradition represents him as a descendant of the Knoxes of Ranfurly—a distinguished family whose characteristic armorial device is an eagle. His education at Haddington and Glasgow presents few points of special interest. He must have been regarded as a good scholar, for he subsequently became a tutor at St. Andrews ; but he himself declared that his early training was lamentably deficient. He studied law and was for some time a notary. He received minor orders, and, according to some authorities, was hurried into the priesthood without due consideration ; but this latter fact is not sufficiently established. It appears certain that he studied the writings of Augustine, and the result was the same as in the case of the earlier Reformers. He soon received a call and began to preach to a congregation of Protestants. Too honest to hide his convictions, too bold to fear the condemnation of his ecclesiastical superiors, his preaching, as was said

at a later date, "had more force and power than a hundred trumpets." Betrayed into the power of his enemies, he was carried to France and condemned to the galleys. According to recent researches it appears that the discipline was in his case somewhat relaxed, for he did some literary work during his imprisonment; but there is no reason to doubt that, like others of his faith, he was sometimes chained to an oar of the government vessel in which he was confined. Tyranny never devised imprisonment more oppressive than this. The form of the vessels, it has been said, differed but little from the type adopted by the ancient Romans in their conflicts with the Carthaginians. There were two banks of oars, by which the vessel was propelled, and to every oar a slave was chained. Between them stood the taskmaster, with a long lash, which he brought down on the shoulders of the slave whose arm grew weary or who paused to speak a word. Ordinarily there was the silence of the grave, but at times nature could no longer be restrained; and, accompanied by the sound of the lash—with quivering flesh and with blood streaming over the deck—the enslaved Huguenots sang their favorite psalm: "Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing?"

The eighteen months which John Knox spent in the galleys were an important part of his education. If he became sterner than the other Reform-

ers—more uncompromising in his rejection of every rag of papal splendor—can we wonder at it after the training which he had received in the galleys?

How Knox escaped from this dreadful imprisonment is not quite clear. It has been suggested that he was discharged on the personal request of the young king of England; but it is likely enough that after the marriage of Mary of Scotland to the dauphin of France the French court no longer dreaded his influence and let him go. Knox went to England and during the reign of Edward labored with voice and pen, holding at one time the position of chaplain to the king. Dr. Lorimer maintains that he was the first to substitute the use of common bread for "wafer-breads" in the Lord's Supper—a practice which was afterwards authorized by the king. He was consulted in the preparation of the formularies of the church of England; and a book of forty-five articles of religion, from which the thirty-nine articles were afterward derived, was submitted to him for his opinion. The king desired to make him bishop of Rochester; but Knox himself states that he was unwilling to accept even the modified formularies of the English church, regarding them as leading to Romanism, though he was "favorable to an office similar to the bishop's."

When Mary became queen Knox went to the continent, and in 1554 met for the first time, at

Geneva, John Calvin, whom he made in all things his spiritual guide. "In other places," he wrote, "I confess that Christ is truly preached, but nowhere else have I found religion and manners so truly reformed." Though nearly fifty years old Knox became a scholar in Calvin's school, and with great humility studied Greek in company with boys who were not yet out of their teens. In the mean time he wrote about a dozen books, or pamphlets, and preached for a little congregation of English refugees which with difficulty provided him with the means of subsistence.

It is plain enough that the fiery disposition of Knox gave the Swiss reformers some trouble. Bullinger reported to Calvin his cautious replies on such questions as "whether a female can rule a kingdom by divine right, and transfer the right to her husband," and "to which party must godly persons attach themselves in a case of a religious nobility resisting an idolatrous sovereign." A book which Knox wrote at this time, but which had better have remained unwritten, was entitled "The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women." The book was anonymous, but the identity of the author could not be concealed; and it was for this publication that Queen Elizabeth forbade him to set foot on English soil. Knox afterwards wrote: "My First Blast hath blown from me all my friends in England."

Several times Knox paid short visits to Scotland, but each time returned to Geneva, saying, that the time was not yet come. In 1559, however, he exclaimed: "Now Scotland is ripe!" Returning to Scotland he became the religious leader of the Protestants, and in one year their cause was practically gained. In 1560 Parliament declared that the papal system was abrogated and in the same year formally adopted the Scotch confession. In no other country was the reformation so immediately successful, and, indeed, in some districts it partook largely of the nature of a popular tumult.

The conflicts of Knox with Mary Queen of Scots, have been made the subject of much discussion, and there are circumstances connected with them which history has left obscure. When that unfortunate queen returned to Scotland in 1561, it must be remembered, the country was already formally Protestant, so that in opposing her efforts to re-establish the mass Knox was standing on firm ground. He spoke to the queen like a Hebrew prophet; and we are told that "she wept many salt tears;" but they were probably tears of anger rather than of genuine contrition.

Knox was the object of Mary's special aversion, and when she found that blandishments and threatenings were alike unavailing, she sought to secure his condemnation for treason. All her efforts were vain; a single sermon by Knox had more power

than many royal proclamations. By his tremendous earnestness he united a turbulent nobility and an uneducated people, filling all classes with inextinguishable hatred for everything that reminded them of Rome.

Mary Stuart was more closely allied to France than to Scotland. Her mother had been a daughter of the great house of Guise, and from that family she may be supposed to have derived her personal beauty as well as her religious fanaticism. At the court of her first husband, Francis II., she had practiced the superficial accomplishments which added so greatly to her fascinations; but she had also breathed an air that was reeking with assassination. That she could be devout after the fashion which she had been taught will hardly be questioned by those who have studied her profound and poetical religious utterances; but she failed to appreciate the fact that even royal personages must be obedient to the moral law.

It is not necessary to enter minutely into the history of Mary's unfortunate reign. The question of her guilt or innocence of the crimes charged against her is still debated; and with regard to her complicity in the murder of her second husband, Henry Darnley, we can hardly claim to know more than the great historian Ranke, who says that after twenty years' study of the subject he still remains undecided. That she was greatly sinned against

cannot be doubted; no crowned head had ever been compelled to endure so many indignities. The murder of Rizzio in her presence may have seemed a crime that cried for vengeance. We may hope that she was not accessory to the murder of Darnley; but it is certain that immediately afterwards she showed great favor to James Hepburn, earl of Bothwell, who was generally regarded as the murderer, and that within three months she married him. It is claimed that she did this under compulsion; but the people of Scotland were disgusted, as well they might be, and the natural result was civil war.

Her party having been defeated at Langside, May 13, 1568, Queen Mary very foolishly fled to England, to place herself under the protection of Elizabeth. The latter regarded her as her chief rival, and is said to have expressed her purpose in the stanza:

> "The daughter of debate,
> Who discord still doth sow,
> Shall reap no gain where former rule
> Hath taught still peace to grow."

For more than eighteen years Mary was imprisoned, and finally she was condemned and executed. However guilty Mary may have been it is certain that no English court had authority to try and condemn the queen of Scotland.

After the flight of the queen there was in Scotland a period of confusion and violence. Against the protest of Knox and his coadjutors the nobles appropriated the property of the church, as they had done in England; they secured the appointment of so-called "Tulchan bishops" who turned over to their patrons the revenues of their sees. The later years of the great Reformer were therefore clouded with sorrow; but after all he succeeded in moulding the church according to the ideal of Geneva, so that it became more completely than any other national church the church of Calvin. Stern and strict as the Scotch ideal may appear to foreigners there can be no question as to the glorious examples of earnest piety which it has produced.

Though the Protestant churches of England and Scotland differed in government and cultus from the beginning it was not until the seventeenth century that they were arrayed against each other in violent conflict. The frequent attempts of English monarchs after the union of the kingdoms to extend English forms of government and service to the Scotch churches produced opposition which intensified peculiarities that had previously received comparatively little attention. In the Reformed churches of the continent local differences in organization are but lightly regarded; and men of great intelligence find it difficult to appreciate the import-

ance which is in Great Britain attached to such matters. It should, however, be remembered that it was not until sixty-five years after the death of Knox that the dean of Edinburgh attempted to read the English liturgy at St. Giles, and that Jenny Geddes expressed her indignation by flinging her camp-stool at his head.

The last important public utterance of John Knox was his sermon on receiving the news of the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Being assisted to reach the pulpit he summoned his remaining strength to thunder out the vengeance of heaven against that "cruel murderer and false traitor the king of France," at the same time "desiring the French ambassador to tell his master that sentence was pronounced against him in Scotland; that divine vengeance would never depart from him nor from his house, if repentance did not ensue, but that his name would remain an execration to all succeeding generations." Two months later, on the 27th of November, 1572, John Knox died. At his open grave the earl of Morton exclaimed: "Here lieth a man who in his life never feared the face of man; who hath often been threatened with poison and dagger, but hath ended his course with peace and honor." He had been, indeed, "a mighty one in Israel."

It is not easy to form an adequate conception of the character of such a man as Knox. "He

was another Calvin," says a recent German biographer, "less scholarly and profound than his model, but personally bolder and more eloquent." Though his religious antagonists have represented him as fierce and contentious, it has been remarked that he never came into violent conflict with any minister of the Reformed church of Scotland. During the conflicts under the later Stuarts his memory was attacked on grounds which now appear frivolous, not to say contemptible. It was said that he was a fanatic; but how could that trifling and degenerate age pass judgment on a strong man who had consecrated all his powers to the pursuit of a grand ideal? It was declared that he was a politician, as if in those days any leader on either side had not been a politician. The imputation that he was rude in appearance and manner is perhaps best answered by McCrie when he inquires in Scriptural language: "What went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings' houses." That Knox was lacking in some of the amenities of life may be true enough; but it is also true that to have given the Scotch Reformation a leader who was mild and conciliatory would have been to send a child to fight a giant.

Cranmer and Knox! Could any names be mentioned that would represent men more different in temperament and natural inclination? The one a

courtier, the other a popular champion ; yet each in his own way peforming his appointed work. Between these limits every variety of thought and action might find a place. Can there be anywhere a better illustration of the fact that the spirit of the great Reformation was not local or limited, but as broad as humanity itself?

Above all, these decided differences reveal the fundamental truths that the instruments of Providence are not chosen on grounds that are evident to human understanding, and that the strength of God is made perfect in the weakness of men.

VI.

THE THREEFOLD CORD.

FREDERICK III. OF THE PALATINATE, OLEVIANUS, AND URSINUS.

"A THREEFOLD cord is not quickly broken." At Heidelberg in the Palatinate a cord was twined which though often severely tested has retained its strength. One of the strands was taken from Zurich and another from Geneva; but the third was thoroughly German, and from the latter the whole received its distinctive character. All this becomes evident in the development of the Reformed churches of Germany and Holland, and no less in the fortunes of their chief confession of faith, the Heidelberg Catechism.

The Palatinate of the Rhine was in the days of the Reformation the richest province in Germany, and its elector was a king in all but name. His capital was Heidelberg, whose university was the chief glory of all that region. By a political arrangement the elector also ruled the Upper Palatinate—now a Bavarian province—but it is with the Lower Palatinate or "Rheinpfalz" that we are at present chiefly concerned. Though its name has disappeared from the map of Europe, the Palatinate is still popularly recognized as the heart of Germany; and it is easy to see that on account of its geographical position, if for no other reason, it

FREDERICK III.

must necessarily have become the theater of important events in the period of the Reformation.

The electors of the Palatinate were slower than their neighbors in accepting the doctrines of the Reformation. At first they had been under Austrian influence; and at a later period they were terrified by the Peasant War. It was, however, in Heidelberg that Luther had gained one of his earliest successes; for at a disputation held in that city in 1518 he had secured the adherence of Bucer, Brenz, and Schnepfius.

In 1520 the German knights declared in favor of Luther; and Sickingen's castle of Ebernburg, near Worms, became a refuge for the oppressed. As early as 1522 Sickingen's chaplain, Oecolampadius, not only preached in German, which was then very unusual, but also read in the vernacular the Scripture passages which appeared in the liturgy. "This," says Goebel, "was then as surprising as it would be if a German pastor should now undertake to read them in *Plattdeutsch*." After the death of Sickingen, in 1523, there was a reaction, and for some years the Palatinate remained attached to Rome.

In the mean time neighboring districts had made rapid progress. Philip of Hesse had been an early friend of Luther, and mainly through the influence of its ruler his principality soon became decidedly Protestant. It will be remembered that it

was by his negotiation that Luther and Zwingli were brought together at Marburg, and that he subsequently became an intimate friend of Zwingli. The man whom Philip authorized to reorganize the Hessian churches on a Protestant basis was Francis Lambert, of Avignon. Lambert had been a celebrated preacher in the Roman Catholic church of the South of France, but came into communication with the Waldenses and was influenced by them. Having ventured to read the writings of Luther he was compelled to flee, and after many perils found a refuge in Zurich. Subsequently he visited Luther at Wittenberg and accepted the Lutheran faith. He was not a controversialist, but occupied a position as nearly as possible half-way between the two reformers. He proposed to give the churches a liberal constitution, like that which prevailed in Switzerland; but this the secular authorities would not allow. The landgrave Philip, however, sustained Lambert, and did all in his power to discourage controversy on the sacramental question. Even on his deathbed he exacted a promise from his sons to remain faithful to the articles of agreement between the Lutherans and Reformed which Bucer and Melancthon had prepared. In this way the churches of Hesse and several adjacent districts assumed an irenic character which was as far as possible removed from the fierce dogmatism of Saxony. They held, in fact, to the mild Luth-

eranism which became generally prevalent in southern Germany, and which at a later date was stigmatized by the zealots as "Philipism," because Philip Melancthon was regarded as its chief exponent and defender.

Melancthon is termed by Seisen, "the true reformer of the Palatinate." He was a native of that country, and was naturally there regarded with the profoundest reverence. When the reformation of the church was finally undertaken his advice was solicited at every step, and the men who were actively engaged in the work were proud to be known as his disciples. The position which he personally occupied is perhaps not generally understood; but it is hardly just to denounce him as weak or inconsistent. The fact is that he was from the beginning what would now be called "a union man;" holding consistently to what he believed to be the truth, but always treating his opponents with courtesy and willing to do all in his power to promote the reunion of the church. For many years he believed that reconciliation with Rome was not impossible; and he himself declared that when he wrote the Augsburg Confession, in 1530, he had this end in view. In the tenth article, treating of the Lord's Supper which was then the chief object of discussion, he accordingly presented the doctrine of Luther in its fullest development, expressly condemning those who held a contrary

opinion. He evidently believed that his definition of the doctrine would find acceptance with the Roman Catholics, and that the parties would in this way be drawn more closely together. The Reformed, against whom the condemnatory clause was directed, were at that time few in number; and though four Reformed cities in the south of Germany ventured to present to the diet a separate confession of their doctrine, it was entirely ignored.

Melancthon was greatly disappointed that the Augsburg Confession did not lead to the result which he so greatly desired. For four years he remained hoping against hope; but then reluctantly acknowledged that reunion with Rome was impossible. He now became especially anxious to preserve the unity of Protestantism, and held many conferences with the leaders of the Reformed movement. In 1536, in conjunction with Bucer, he drew up the articles of the so-called Wittenberg Union; and in 1540 changed the 10th article of the Augsburg Confession, by omitting the condemnatory clause and otherwise altering the language, so that it might no longer be objectionable to the Reformed church. The latter act was by the zealots of his own church regarded as unpardonable treason, and after the death of Luther the feeling against him became intense. "Philipism" was declared to be as bad as Calvinism. Minor points of difference between Luther and Melancthon were sought out

and made the occasion of bitter controversies. Melancthon's friends were deposed and banished for trivial reasons, and the extremists did not hesitate to say that they would not rest until they had driven Melancthon out of Germany. In this purpose they were foiled, for he had powerful friends and large sections of the church remained closely attached to him; but it is not surprising that he prayed to be delivered from "the wrath of the theologians," and that, a short time before his death he even seriously proposed to go to Palestine, to spend his remaining days in the cell at Bethlehem once occupied by St. Jerome.

It was in the closing years of Melancthon's life that the Palatinate accepted the Reformation. In 1546 the aged elector Frederick II., feeling convinced that this great popular movement was no longer to be resisted, introduced the ecclesiastical order which Melancthon had prepared for Mecklenburg. His successor, Otho Henry ("Ottheinrich") went a step further and declared his adherence to the Augsburg Confession "as explained by Melancthon." He was an enlightened prince and a munificent patron of the University of Heidelberg. On his death without children, in 1559, the electoral dignity passed to his cousin, Frederick III., popularly surnamed the Pious.

The biography of this excellent prince is more than ordinarily interesting. He was born at Sim-

mern on the 14th of February, 1515. His father, John II., who was a man of culture, ruled over the small possessions of the house of Simmern. He was a Roman Catholic, though it is said that on his death-bed he accepted the Protestant faith. The son was carefully trained in all the accomplishments which were deemed suitable to his position. In his early youth he served at the courts of the cardinal of Lorraine and the bishop of Liege, and like other earnest men of his day, was greatly disgusted by the conduct of ecclesiastics in high station. No one seems to know with certainty under what circumstances he became a Protestant, but it has been supposed that he was converted by John A'Lasco.* His wife—a daughter of Margrave Casimir of Brandenburg—had been educated in the Lutheran faith, and probably exerted some influence in this direction. It is certain that as early as 1546 he became a decided Protestant.

Frederick's early career did not differ greatly from that of others of his rank and station. He was ambitious of military distinction, and when only eighteen years of age led a company of sol-

* John A'Lasco (or De Lasky) was born at Warsaw, Poland, in 1499, and died January 13, 1560. He belonged to a distinguished family, and was himself a bishop of the Roman Catholic church. Having been converted to Protestantism—mainly through the influence of Zwingli—he resigned his bishopric and devoted his life to preaching the Gospel. From 1550 to 1553 he was superintendent of the churches of the Refugees in London, but fled on the accession of Mary, and endured many privations. He is regarded as the chief organizer of the Reformed church in the northern countries of Europe.

diers against the Turks. On his return he received the honor of knighthood from the emperor. For two years he was count of Simmeros, and during this period is said to have been very poor. His nature was generous and he was especially liberal to those who suffered persecutions; but his revenue was small, and at times his family was actually in want of the necessaries of life. It was at this time that his religious disposition became especially apparent, and he often said: "I know my Lord will never give me up." Relief came when, in 1556, the elector Otho Henry recognized him as his prospective heir and appointed him his representative in the Upper Palatinate.

When Frederick became elector he found the Palatinate greatly disturbed by controversy. Two great movements of religious life had come from opposite directions and had met at the Rhine. The Zurich consensus of 1549 had united the Zwinglian and Calvinistic parties; the Reformed church which resulted from this union had now become a powerful body, and the English and Dutch refugees became its advanced guard in Germany. To the enthusiasts for pure Lutheran doctrine it appeared a real danger to the fatherland, and every means was taken to resist its gathering strength. Joachim Westphal, Lutheran pastor at Hamburg, sounded a trumpet for the onslaught, and he was powerfully seconded by Heshusius, Flacius and others. The

conflict was in fact a revival of the old sacramental controversy, but it became even more violent than it had been in the days of Luther.

Frederick III. had just entered upon the government of the Palatinate when he found himself in the midst of the storm. His predecessor had appointed to the office of general superintendent Tileman Heshusius, who was a violent controversialist. In denouncing the Calvinists he boldly accused them of being at heart Mohammedans, who were merely waiting for a Turkish victory to cast off their disguise and enlist under the banner of the prophet.

Such accusations naturally did not remain unanswered. Klebitz, the most eloquent preacher in Heidelberg, was an extreme Calvinist who seems to have rejoiced to engage in a controversy with the more celebrated Heshusius. He was as violent and abusive as his antagonist, and between them they soon had all Heidelberg in a blaze. The elector Frederick was greatly troubled, for in those days theological controversies were as violent, and often as dangerous to the state, as the fiercest political conflicts of more modern times. At first he issued a proclamation in which he appealed to the theologians to abstain from controversy and to devote their time to the spiritual edification of the people. As he had said on a previous occasion, he could "see no reason why Christians who agree in essen-

tials should engage in bitter controversy concerning minor matters, thus placing a sword in the hands of their enemies and even in those of the devil himself."

As might have been expected, the elector's proclamation remained unheeded. In fact, the only evident result was to turn both contestants against their ruler, whom they ventured to denounce for interfering in matters which did not concern him. As a last resort the elector, in accordance with the advice of Melancthon, banished both Heshusius and Klebitz from the Palatinate.

It was hoped that this would be the conclusion of the conflict, but it proved to be no more than a beginning. It became evident that the mediating position of Melancthon could no longer be maintained, and in 1559 the elector publicly declared his adherence to the doctrine of the Reformed church. It was a bold step and there can be no doubt of the genuineness of his convictions. He had earnestly studied the questions at issue, and when he had reached a conclusion he did not hesitate to accept the consequences which it involved.

At first sight it might appear as if the change had not been very important. A German writer says: "He (Frederick) had simply crossed the almost imperceptible line which separated Melancthonianism from the mildest form of Calvinism." His cotemporaries, however, were not disposed to

take this view of his transition. The princes declared the act an infringment of the terms of the Peace of Augsburg ; the theologians of the stricter Lutheran type denounced it as treason to evangelical truth. Soon all Germany was in a blaze, and the pious elector appeared to stand alone in the midst of the fire.

At this period the attitude of the prince was positively heroic. Even his family disagreed with him ; and his wife, who subsequently became his faithful coadjutor in the work of reformation, appealed to the rulers of neighboring provinces to exert their influence in restraining her husband from taking what she supposed to be a fatal step. The people generally believed that Frederick would be deprived of his electorate and might possibly be put to death. On one occasion several princes met at Stuttgart for the purpose of formulating charges against him ; but for some unknown reason they adjourned without taking positive action.

In the face of all this opposition the elector remained calm and serene. At all times ready to suffer for what he believed to be the truth, his free and joyous nature enabled him to triumph over difficulties which might to others have appeared insurmountable. In 1560 he removed from the churches the furniture which had remained in them since Roman Catholic days, and directed the services to be conducted after the manner of the Re-

formed church. At the same time he professed his attachment to the Augsburg Confession (of 1540), declaring that he had not changed his convictions, but had merely advanced to the perception of higher truth.

That the elector's methods were stern is freely conceded. It must be remembered that, in common with most of the princes of his day, he believed himself to be personally responsible for the faith of his subjects; and he accordingly did not hesitate to remove from their positions professors and pastors who refused to follow him. In this position he was strengthened by his favorite physician, Thomas Erastus, an able writer, after whom the whole theory of the control of the church by the state has been called "Erastianism." The only people, however, who were severely punished in accordance with the civil law were the Arians, who had become numerous in Heidelberg. Concerning one of these, named Neuser, it is related that he was at first a Lutheran, then became Reformed, then declared himself an Arian and denied the divinity of Christ, and after his expulsion from Heidelberg, fled to Constantinople, where he joined the Mohammedans and finally died an atheist.

The preparation of a confession of faith had now become a necessity; and it was fortunate for the Reformed church of Germany that there were at hand two men to whom the work could safely be

committed. These men were Olevianus and Ursinus, one of whom was but twenty-six and the other twenty-eight years of age. The elector manifested great powers of discernment in selecting them for the work of preparing a catechism that would not only faithfully represent the faith of the Reformed church, but might serve as a means of conveying its precious truths to subsequent generations. Together they produced a work which has ever since been regarded as the crown and glory of the Reformed church.

CASPAR OLEVIANUS (1535–1587) was a native of the ancient city of Treves. The family name, which was properly Von der Olewig, was derived from a suburb of the city in which the family resided. There were two sons, one of whom studied medicine and the other law. The latter, after passing through the schools of his native country, was sent to France and successively studied at Paris and Bourges. It is remarkable that his career closely resembled that of John Calvin, whom he greatly admired. He studied law but devoted much time to reading the Scriptures, and secretly connected himself with a Protestant congregation, though without immediately and completely consecrating his heart and life to the cause of truth. The decisive event of his life, as he always declared, occurred when he almost lost his life in attempting to save a son of the elector of the Palatinate who was acci-

dentally drowned in the Oron river. In the moment of the greatest danger he vowed that if God should save his life he would consecrate it entirely to the conversion of his native land. In this vow he was afterwards confirmed by the admonitions of the venerable Farel, at Lausanne. After receiving the degree of doctor of laws he visited Geneva and Zurich and then returned to his native city. Here he taught Latin, but at the same time used every opportunity to preach the Gospel ; and for the latter reason was arrested and cast into prison. Released through the potent intercession of the elector Frederick, he went to Heidelberg, where he was at first professor of theology and subsequently pastor of the principal church of the city. Though the elector generally took his own way, in religious as well as in secular matters, Olevianus became his most intimate friend, and his influence in the general organization of the church was plainly apparent. He was a splendid orator and a master of German style. The part which he took in the composition of the Heidelberg Catechism was probably less important than that of Ursinus, but traces of his hand are everywhere visible. To him have been ascribed the decidedly Calvinistic elements of the book ; and what is said concerning Christian discipline is almost certainly derived from him, as its substance may be found in his previous writings. As long as the elector lived, Olevianus remained his most

devoted assistant; but afterwards he went to Herborn, where he died on the 15th of March, 1587. On his deathbed he was asked whether he was certain of salvation, and he replied "*Certissimus*," that is, "Most certain.

ZACHARIAS URSINUS (1534–1583) was a native of Breslau, in Silesia. The family name was originally Von Baer, but his father, who was dean of St. Magdalen's church, had Latinized it according to the fashion of the times. The son was unusually talented and studied philosophy and mathematics when he was a mere child. At sixteen he was sent to the university of Wittenberg, where Melancthon was, after the death of Luther, the ruling spirit. Here he studied theology and his extraordinary analytic power soon attracted attention. Melancthon declared him his favorite pupil, and did not hesitate to say that his writings were unusually brilliant. On the death of that great man there was a reaction in favor of high Lutheranism; and the favorite disciples of Melancthon were singled out for persecution. Ursinus, who was of a quiet, contemplative disposition, determined to withdraw from the scene of conflict. When one of his uncles asked him whither he was going he replied: "If my dear Master Philip were living I would never leave him; but now that he has departed I shall go to Zurich." In Switzerland he studied the writings of Calvin and others, and accepted

their teachings, though without giving up his Melancthonian standpoint. He became especially attached to Peter Martyr, one of the leading theologians of the Reformed church, and at his suggestion he was invited by Frederick III. to become professor of theology at Heidelberg. Here he was intimately associated with Olevianus; and it was but natural that to these two men should be committed the important work of preparing the new Confession of Faith.

It is not easy to understand how men so different in disposition and training could unite in producing a thoroughly harmonious work. Olevianus was fiery and eloquent; Ursinus was retiring and didactic. The one took an intense interest in public affairs; the other made few friends and cared more for books than for popular applause. Olevianus was a Calvinist and Ursinus a disciple of Melancthon; but together they prepared a work in which the individuality of each disappears, and which possesses a much higher order of merit than anything which either could have separately produced. Surely, this is one of the marvels of literature.

Ursinus was the principal author of the Heidelberg Catechism, and from him its profoundly Christologic character was no doubt chiefly derived. In its preparation materials derived from the writidgs of Calvin and A'Lasco were freely employed, but it is in the fullest sense an original work. Its

general tone is irenic and conciliatory, though it contains several polemic questions which are believed to have been inserted at the express command of the elector, if they were not actually composed by him. The eightieth question, which declares the Roman mass to be "an accursed idolatry," was inserted into the second edition, and has been supposed to have been in some degree a counter-blast on the part of the elector to the fulminations of the council of Trent.

The later years of Ursinus were comparatively uneventful. He was recognized as a theologian of the highest order, and it became his chief duty to explain and defend the catechism. After Frederick's death, in 1576, he was removed from his professorship at Heidelberg; and though he was offered a similar position in his native city, he preferred to become a teacher in a theological school which the elector's second son, John Casimir, had founded at Neustadt. Here he labored for five years, and died on the 6th of March, 1583, in his forty-ninth year. On his monument was placed an inscription which called him "a great theologian, a conqueror of heresies concerning the person of Christ and the Lord's Supper, mighty with word and pen, an acute philosopher, a wise man, and a stern instructor of youth."

It has been the fate of the Heidelberg Catechism to be extravagantly praised by its friends and as

fiercely denounced by its enemies. Immediately after its publication, in 1563, it was formally approved by Bullinger and the church of Zurich ; and the bonds which connected the Palatinate with Switzerland were thereby strengthened. From that day to this it has been the most generally accepted confession of the Reformed church, and its excellencies as an exposition of Reformed doctrine have been almost universally recognized. Max Goebel says: "The Heidelberg Catechism may be regarded as the flower and fruit of the entire German and French reformation ; it has Lutheran earnestness, Melancthonian clearness, Zwinglian simplicity, and Calvinistic fire, all harmoniously blended ; and therefore notwithstanding many defects and hardnesses, it has been, together with the Augsburg Confession of 1540, the only common confession and doctrinal standard of the entire German Reformed church from the Palatinate to the Netherlands, and to Brandenburg and Prussia."

In a general way the tone of the Heidelberg Catechism was irenic ; but it must not be supposed that its authors expected it to be accepted without controversy. They were in the midst of one of the greatest conflicts in the history of the church ; and it was but natural that they should endeavor to justify their position. On several points which were at the time most violently discussed we could wish that they had expressed themselves differently ; but

the fact that they were thoroughly honest has never been called into question. It was, however, to these points that the attacks of their enemies were especially directed, and the conflict became more intense than ever.

In 1566 the emperor Maximilian II. cited the elector Frederick to appear before the diet at Augsburg; and the summons was generally believed to be equivalent to his condemnation. His brother, Richard of Simmern, was greatly alarmed, and warned him that it would be safer not to attend the diet; but he wrote in reply: "I confide in my dear and faithful Father in heaven, trusting that He will employ me as an instrument of His omnipotence to declare His name in these latter days, not only in word but also in deed, to the holy empire of the German nation, as my dear brother-in-law, the late elector duke John Frederick of Saxony, also did; and though I am not so bold as to compare myself in intellectual strength with the departed elector, I know that the same God who preserved him in the knowledge of His holy Gospel is still living and mighty, and that He will preserve me, a poor weak man, through the power of His Holy Spirit, even though it should cost my blood; and if it should please my God and Father to grant me this honor, I could never be sufficiently thankful, whether in this world or in the world to come."

The appearance of the elector before the diet of Augsburg was an act of the highest courage. Though he was supreme in his own province he was supposed to be powerless in the presence of the emperor and the assembled princes. At first he seemed to have no friends, and it was proposed to exclude him from the terms of the treaty of Augsburg, unless he signed a complete recantation of his religious views. In Heidelberg it was reported that he had been arrested and executed. It soon, however, became evident that the earnestness and unaffected piety of the elector was making a profound impression; and this effect was increased by several excellent sermons preached by his chaplain. Finally the emperor formulated a decree commanding Frederick to abstain from introducing "Calvinistic novelties," and requiring him to restore to the Roman church the property of certain convents which had been alienated by the civil power. During the discussion of this decree the elector was required to absent himself from the assembly; but after its adoption he re-entered the hall, followed by his son, John Casimir, whom he called his "spiritual armor-bearer," the latter bearing the Bible and the Augsburg Confession. On this oacasion he offered the memorable defense in which he declared that he was not concerned for "a cap full of flesh"—by which he meant his own head—but for the salvation of his soul. He said

that he did not know whether he could properly be called a Calvinist, for he had never read the works of Calvin; but he was willing to stand by his catechism, which contained the substance of his faith and was so thoroughly fortified by proofs from the Scriptures that it could not be refuted.

The heroism and devotion of the elector were unmistakable, and the assmbly was deeply impressed. After adjournment Augustus of Saxony put his hand on his shoulder and said: "Fritz, thou art more pious than the whole of us!" The Margrave of Baden also said to the assembled princes: "Why trouble ye the elector? He has more piety than all of us put together." Violent measures were now out of the question; and a mild resolution was adopted in which it was declared that the elector was in full accordance with the Augsburg Confession in the article of justification by faith, which had caused the schism in the church, and in many other articles, but did not fully accept the article concerning the Lord's Supper. Nevertheless, as he had indicated his willingness to yield to proofs taken from the word of God, they (the princes) would in due time seek to convince him of his error. In the mean time they "had no desire to oppress the elector of the Palatinate and others who might vary from the confession in one or more articles, and thus to increase the sufferings of the confessors of Christ."

On his return to Heidelberg Frederick was received with the utmost enthusiasm. The princes no longer interfered with his projects of reform, as he had been tacitly recognized as an adherent of the Augsburg Confession. The Palatinate liturgy, which had been published in the same year with the catechism was generally introduced, and became a model for the liturgies of other countries. The elector was respected even by his enemies, and in time was regarded as the political leader of the Protestants of Germany. His second wife, a countess of Neuenar, was a sister-in-law of count Egmont, who was executed by the cruel duke of Alva; and she aided him with all her might in preparing a refuge for the exiles of Holland. He appealed to the king of France in behalf of the Huguenots; and after the massacre of St. Bartholomew sent his son John Casimir with a company of soldiers to aid Henry of Navarre. Another of his sons lost his life in battle in the Netherlands; but the father consoled himself with the reflection that he had fallen on the field of honor for the cause of God and man. To the emperor, Maximilian II., he personally presented a Spanish Bible, with the words: "Your Majesty, I herewith present you the treasure of treasures; it contains that heavenly wisdom which teaches emperors, kings, and princes how they may successfully reign."

During the latter years of the elector Frederick it was his chief affliction that his eldest son, Louis, whom he had made his representative in the Upper Palatinate, had become alienated through the influence of the high Lutheran party, and was violently opposed to the reforms which his father had introduced. In his own way the son was a devout man; but it is an illustration of the controversial character of the times that he refused to see his father on his death-bed, for fear that the latter might make him promise to leave the organization of the church unchanged. When the elector Frederick felt that his end was approaching he issued an address to his people in which he said: "I have lived long enough for you and for the church, and am now summoned to a better life. I have done my best for the church, but have accomplished little. God, who can do all things, and who cared for His church before I was born, lives and reigns in Heaven; He will not leave you orphans, nor suffer the prayers and tears which I have offered for my successors and the church to remain without a blessing." At the end of his life he exclaimed: "I have been detained here long enough through the prayers of God's people; it is time that my life should come to an end and I be gathered into the true rest with my Saviour." He died in his sixty-first year. Among the confessors of the sixteenth century there is none who deserves a more exalted

place than Frederick III., elector of the Palatinate.

To trace the history of the Reformed church of the Palatinate after the death of Frederick is beyond our present purpose. It may be said in a general way that Louis IV. sought in every possible way to undo his father's work. His reign of seven years was, however, all too brief to enable him to accomplish his purpose ; and when he died, leaving an infant son, his brother, John Casimir, who became ruler *ad interim*, at once adopted a different policy. The young prince was educated in the Reformed church, which remained for many years established by law.

After the Palatinate had led the way a number of German cities and principalities accepted the Reformed confessions. This was due to the continuance of the sacramental controvery in the Lutheran church. It was a period in which theologians reigned, and though many of them were men of the highest order of ability, they manifested a spirit as contentious as that of the secular rulers. Though almost constantly engaged in conflicts among themselves, the Lutheran leaders were, at least, fairly agreed in their antagonism to Calvinism. The Crypto-Calvinists, or secret Calvinists, were driven out of Saxony, and several of them were actually executed. At last the leading theologians of Germany met at the monastery of Bergen, near Magdeburg, and on the 28th of May, 1577, adopted a con-

fession of faith which was called the "Form of Concord." It was, indeed, intended to promote concord, but only among high-Lutherans. From their point of view it was a work of the highest order; and there can be no doubt that for profundity of thought and acuteness of observation it holds the foremost place among the confessions of Germany. It was not, however, a book for the people; and the spirit engendered by the contentions of the schools is plainly apparent. There was evidently no inclination to conciliate the milder party, who were offensively termed "Sacramentarians," and sixteen separate articles were devoted to the refutation of their doctrines. Naturally enough, all this led to renewed controversy, and the "Form of Concord" was frequently called a "form of discord." One by one a considerable number of German cities and principalities which had hitherto held to the milder form of Lutheranism passed over to the Reformed church. Nassau led the way, in 1578, and Bremen, Hanau, Anhalt, Lippe, and part of Hesse followed in rapid succession. The elector, John Sigismund of Brandenburg, from whom the present imperial family of Germany is descended, did not make the change until 1613; and with his transition the schism may be said to have been completed. The Lutherans remained, of course, by far the larger and more important body; but the Reformed church became the leading ecclesiastical

organization along the whole course of the Rhine from its source to the ocean.

The Heidelberg Catechism soon acquired a certain ecumenical character for the Reformed churches on the continent of Europe. It was, indeed, not everywhere employed as a book of instruction for youth; but as a confession of faith its authority was unquestioned. Though not formally adopted in Great Britain it was several times translated into English; and its substantial agreement with the confessions of England and Scotland was freely acknowledged. In Poland and Hungary it was accepted by the Reformed churches; and in the latter country candidates for the ministry were required to make a public profession of their purpose to defend it against all opponents.

Holland was, however, the country in which the Heidelberg Catechism was most joyously received, and most earnestly defended. Protestantism had, indeed, been established there at an earlier period. If we desired to trace it to its beginnings we should have to go back to the fourteenth century when the "Brethren of the Common Life" assumed a position which was decidedly antagonistic to the pretensions of Rome. Then came the mystics—men like Wessel Gansfort and Thomas á Kempis—who led the people away from the barren wastes of scholasticism to the pure fountains of the word of God. The Waldenses had not

failed to prepare the way for a reformation in faith and practice; and last of all appeared Erasmus of Rotterdam, who while he attacked the corruption of Rome with keenest satire directed the people to higher ideals of the true, the beautiful, and the good.

When Luther began the German reformation he found many coadjutors in Holland. In 1523 two young Augustinians, Henry Voes and John Esch, were burned in the public square of Antwerp for their adhesion to evangelical truth. They had the sympathy of the people, and when they were led away to execution the crowd at the windows and on the house-tops called to them to be faithful to the Gospel. In the flames the martyrs responsively sang the Te Deum until their voices were hushed in death. In memory of these sufferers Luther composed one of his most beautiful hymns.

During the earlier years of the Reformation no formal confession of faith was adopted by the Protestants of Holland. Gradually, however, the principles of Calvin and A'Lasco became predominant,* and in this way the church acquired an indelible character. In 1559, as we have seen, Guido de Bres composed the Belgic confession; and in 1565 twenty noblemen formed a covenant to resist

* The earliest Protestant confession of faith in the Dutch language was published by A'Lasco in 1550. Though not formally adopted, it was extensively circulated.

the Spanish inquisition. In 1566 the Heidelberg Catechism was accepted by the synod of Antwerp as "a form according to the faith;" in 1568 it was recommended for use in all churches speaking the Dutch language. Six years later this advice became a formal decree. Finally, at the great synod of Dort, in 1618, the catechism was declared to be "accordant in all respects to the word of God."

That the Heidelberg Catechism was so speedily adopted in Holland was due in great measure to the influence of the elector Frederick of the Palatinate and of his chaplain, Peter Dathenus. The latter, who was a native of Holland, was the first to translate the catechism into the Dutch language, and by direction of the elector Frederick, he held synods along the lower Rhine and on the border of Holland. At the time of the greatest persecution, in 1568, the delegates of the Dutch churches crossed the line and held an important synod on German territory in the city of Wesel, under the presidency of Peter Dathenus.

The courage and persistence of the Reformed church of Holland during the terrible persecutions of the Spanish rule is one of the marvels of history. At the beginning of the Reformation the sixteen provinces, known by the collective name of the Netherlands, Low Countries or Holland, had been regarded as the most precious possession of the Spanish crown. "The whole country," says a

Spanish writer, "seemed to make only a single city, prosperous communities so pressed upon each other."

The Netherlands had come to Charles V. by inheritance, and he therefore regarded them as in a peculiar sense his personal possession. In Germany the princes were so powerful that he did not venture to interfere with their religious policy. In Holland, on the other hand, he was from the beginning a persecutor, and the victims of his bigotry were numbered by thousands. He was, however, in some respects an intelligent monarch, and in his manner there was a bluff geniality which rendered him popular. He had favored the Flemish merchants by opening outlets for their commerce, and was careful to respect the chartered privileges of their cities. Under such circumstances the persecuted Protestants were compelled to suffer in silence. It would have been folly to resist when the oppressor was the most popular of rulers.

With the accession of his son, Philip II., all this was changed. The Flemish nobility lost their credit at court, and every important office was given to a Spanish grandee. The ancient charters were disregarded and the wealth of the Netherlands was given over to Spanish cupidity. Philip has been called "the incarnation of religious bigotry," and to arrest the progress of the new doctrines he established four new bishoprics which he endowed at

the expense of the country. He declared that he would rather be "a king without subjects than a ruler over heretics." At first he committed the government to his sister Margaret of Parma, but the chief complaint of the people was against Cardinal Granvelle, who was intrusted with the establishment of religious unity. In 1566 between three and four hundred nobles presented to Margaret a petition to remove the pressure from the Protestant churches. On this occasion the count of Barlaimont remarked in an undertone that the petitioners were nothing but "a company of beggars." This expression was overheard, and the confederacy which was subsequently formed was known as "Les Gueux" or "The Beggars." Though the title was at first given in derision it became profoundly significant when a beggar's wallet was assumed as the emblem of a struggle for liberty, and when "the beggars of the sea" swept the Spanish fleets from the ocean.

The nobles of the Netherlands temporized with the government in the hope of gaining concessions; but the people were not to be restrained, and in many places there were mobs which destroyed the images in the churches. Philip now determined to resort to extreme measures, and consequently removed Margaret and sent into the Netherlands his best general, Ferdinand of Toledo, who was best known by his title, the duke of Alva. This man

was especially suited to carry out the purposes of his master. He was cruel by system and never manifested the least sympathy with his victims. Even at the death of his only son he did not exhibit the slightest emotion. "Death," he said, "is an every-day matter, and a wise man will not suffer himself to be affected by it." He immediately established an exceptional court which became known as "the tribunal of blood." The leading nobles were invited to a conference, and counts Egmont and Horn, who unsuspectingly appeared, were arrested and executed. William of Orange had also been invited, but he excused himself and retired to his principality. No wonder that Cardinal Granvelle exclaimed on a subsequent occasion: "If the duke of Alva has not captured the Silent One he has accomplished nothing."

In accordance with his master's instructions the policy of the duke of Alva was stern and merciless. During the six years in which he ruled the Netherlands, it is said, eighteen thousand persons were executed, thirty thousand were deprived of their goods, and one hundred thousand left the country. This destructive policy did not, however, accomplish its purpose; for at the moment when the duke believed he had utterly crushed the city of Brussels the news arrived that the "Beggars" had taken Briel, and that the northern provinces were in arms. Thus began a struggle which lasted, with many in-

termissions, for eighty years, and was entirely concluded only when, in 1648, other nations compelled Spain to recognize the independence of the Dutch republic. It was, on the part of the Hollanders, one of the grandest and most heroic conflicts in the history of the world.

For a brief period the southern provinces were active in their opposition to "the Spanish fury;" but as they were mainly Catholic they fell back under the power of Spain, and subsequently remained dependencies of various powers until they were finally incorporated into the kingdom of Belgium.

The success of the northern provinces was due in great measure to the wisdom and endurance of their leader William of Orange. He belonged to a family, originally German, that was established at many places in Europe. He was born at Nassau in Germany and therefore preferred to be called William of Nassau. His principality was a small district which had originally belonged to Burgundy, but had not yet been swallowed up by France, though surrounded by French territory. His estates in the Netherlands were, however, worth far more than his little principality. He is called "the silent," not from his taciturnity, for he was pleasant and talkative, but because he showed extraordinary wisdom in keeping his own counsel. Great in reverses—like Coligni, whose daughter he

had married—none knew better than he how to profit by the least success. Surrounded by spies, he kept his own counsel; accused by enemies of crimes of which he was innocent, he bore all his trials with calmness and in silence. The foremost generals in Europe attacked him at the head of Spanish armies, but they succeeded only in prolonging the existing struggle. Though fully aware that he was in constant danger of assassination he walked through the streets of Dutch cities, and listened to the grievances of the people. He was even then called "the father of his country;" and to this day his memory is cherished with filial affection.

Philip offered a reward of twenty-five thousand gold crowns and a patent of nobility to any one who should kill the prince of Orange, and at last he succeeded in his wicked purpose. A Burgundian, named Balthasar Gerard, had gained the confidence of the prince, but seized the first opportunity to assassinate him as he was coming down the stairway of his palace at Delft (July 10, 1584). His last thoughts turned towards the sufferings of his countrymen. "Lord have pity on my soul," he prayed, "and on this poor people." The murderer was arrested and executed, but Philip kept his promise and his heirs received the reward of the crime.

William's death was a great blow to the national cause, and for a time the Hollanders were utterly discouraged. The office of stadtholder was, however, conferred upon Maurice, the gifted son of the slain leader. He was but seventeen years old, but immediately manifested extraordinary military genius, and successfully carried on the war in accordance with his father's plans. For over forty years he was the champion of the United Provinces, and it cannot be doubted that he ranks next to his father as a founder of the Dutch republic. Unfortunately, though he personally cared little for theological questions he took a prominent part in the great controversies of the times, apparently for the purpose of increasing his influence and authority. The great controversy of the Gomarists and Arminians was thus greatly embittered; and though Maurice succeeded in crushing the Remonstrants, it has been said that "his later years were stained by a deplorable triumph."

In the midst of these conflicts—in 1618—the famous synod of Dort was held. It was convened by the States-General of Holland, for the purpose of settling religious questions, and was the largest and most important council ever held by the Reformed churches. In one sense it was a national assembly; but in another it was general, for almost all the national Reformed churches of Europe were invited to send delegates, and all of them, except

one or two of the minor German states, accepted the invitation. The king of France, however, forbade the attendance of French delegates; and James I. of England, sent five representatives of the established church of England, but refused to permit the attendance of delegates from the church of Scotland. The canons, or decrees, adopted by the synod of Dort are, however, regarded as the best representation of what is known as the Calvinistic system, and for the church of Holland they became normal. In Germany they were not so favorably received, and Frederick William, the great elector of Brandenburg, actually went so far as to declare them "an apple of discord," and to forbid their promulgation in his dominions. The Heidelberg Catechism, however, remained a common bond of union for the churches of Germany and Holland.

It has been said that the confessions of the Reformed church are all variations of a single theme, and that their differences depend upon the extent to which the Augustinian and Calvinistic principles were carried out. They did not necessarily lead to disagreement. The attention of the churches of Germany and Holland was directed to different aspects of the truth, but they met in Christ at the centre.

In the Palatinate, especially, the Reformed were brought into intimate relations with the Luth-

erans, and it began to be believed that the differences between the churches were not irreconcilable. They were made to suffer together, and it was but natural that they should become more closely allied. For nearly a century the country was trodden under the feet of contending armies, and the fairest country in Europe became almost a wilderness. The electoral house changed its religion no less than four times in as many reigns, and those who were not willing to follow their rulers in their tergiversation were relentlessly oppressed.

In the mean time the church of Rome was using every possible means to recover its lost ground. By the terms of the celebrated "secret article" of the treaty of Westphalia, 1648, the imperial government pledged itself to maintain Roman Catholic worship wherever there were people who desired it; and troops of Jesuits traversed the valley of the Rhine, seeking claimants for the emperor's bounty. Under such conditions dissension among Protestants must have proved utterly disastrous.

In the mean time there grew up in the Reformed church a school of theology which was devout rather than polemic. It cared less for decrees than for covenants, and sought to be biblical rather than scholastic. Coccejus, a native of Bremen, was regarded as its founder, but he himself declared that he had derived his theology from the writings of Olevianus. He was followed by a long line of dis-

tinguished teachers—such as Burmann, Witsins, Lampe and Vitringa—whose names and labors are still gratefully remembered. Under the influence of their teachings the inclination towards Christian union which, ever since the days of Zwingli, has characterized the Reformed church, was revived and extended.

The great religious movement known as Pietism may be said to have resulted in the transformation of the German churches. Its chief leader, Philip Jacob Spener, was a Lutheran, but he had many coadjutors in the Reformed church, among whom Theodore Untereyck was perhaps the most prominent. It is true, of course, that the term Pietist has been greatly misused—being commonly applied to fanatical sectarians who should rather be called Mystics—but in a more extended sense it may properly be employed as a general term for all who, during the great religious revival of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries devoted themselves to the cultivation of the inner life. In 1691 the Pietists founded the university of Halle, and many Reformed as well as Lutheran preachers were educated there. As a natural result of their preaching the church began to regard personal religious experience as of more importance than rigid adherence to doctrinal symbols. It was a period of religious enthusiasm, and gave birth to a multitude of sacred poets, among whom, in the Reformed church, may

be mentioned Joachim Neander, Gerhard Tersteegen, the Zollikofers, Stilling, and Lavater.

Every student of history can tell the story of the French invasion of the Palatinate, in 1689, of which the ruins of the splendid castle at Heidelberg are an abiding memorial. It is said that Louis XIV. entertained the foolish notion that he could protect his country by transforming the Rhine country into a broad band of desert. He at least succeeded in rendering himself infamous to all succeeding generations. Then began the great migration to other lands which—stimulated by wars and resultant poverty—continued throughout the greater part of the eighteenth century. It is from this migration that the Reformed church in the United States is mainly derived.

In Prussia the Reformed and Lutheran churches were, in 1817, consolidated into a single body, known as the Evangelical church. There was to be no confessional change—individuals were to remain Lutheran or Reformed as they had been before, but congregations which declined to enter the union were deprived of government patronage. This "Church Union" has gradually made its way throughout Germany, and now includes most of the churches which were originally Reformed. In some localities confessional distinctions have been almost obliterated, but in others the interference of the government has revived them.

There are still some groups of churches which regard themselves as distinctively Reformed, and these are, of course, closely attached to their ancient confessions.

In Switzerland and Holland the Reformed church is by law established. It is well organized in France and Austria-Hungary, and has scattered congregations in other lands. In America there are two Reformed churches, the one of Dutch and the other of German origin. Altogether the number of adherents of the Reformed confession is not less than ten millions. Though it has been accounted one of the minor branches of Protestantism, its history clearly illustrates the truth that "a threefold cord is not quickly broken." No other denomination of Christians has endured such dreadful persecutions; and its continued existence is one of the wonders of history. Among its chosen emblems have been the burning bush, the lily among the thorns, the ship driven by the winds and the anchor turned heavenward. The appropriateness of these emblems cannot be doubted; but we prefer to them all the device on the seal of an ancient church—a rising sun, with the motto: "After Darkness cometh Light."

INDEX.